

MITTEILUNGEN
DES SEPTUAGINTA-UNTERNEHMENS (MSU) XXI

Text History of the Greek Exodus

Von

John William Wevers

VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT IN GÖTTINGEN

1992

Table of Contents

Chapter I: The Hexaplaric Recension	9
A. Chapters 35—40	9
B. The remaining asterisk tradition	13
C. Hex additions unmarked by asterisk	27
D. Hex word order	31
E. The obelus tradition	36
F. PreOrigenian revision	40
Chapter II: The Byzantine Text Group	41
A. Possible recensional activity	41
B. Nature of the Byzantine text	46
C. Its place in the Exod text tradition	59
Chapter III: The Catena Text	64
A. Membership in the Catena text	64
B. Cohesiveness of the tradition	67
C. Influence of the Catena text tradition	73
Chapter IV: The Texts of A and B	81
A. The B Text	81
B. The A Text	93
Chapter V: The Text of Cyril of Alexandria's <i>De Adoratione</i> and <i>Glaphyra</i> . .	104
Chapter VI: The Composition of Exod 35 to 40	117
A. The nature of Exod A	119
B. Exod B and the Hebrew B account	126
C. Part 1: 35 ₁ —36 ₇	127
D. Part 2: 36 ₈ —37 ₂₁	129
E. Part 3: 38 ₁ —39 ₁₁	133
F. Part 4: 39 ₁₄ —40 ₃₂	141
G. Concluding statement	143

Chapter VII: The Critical Text (Exod)	147
A. General remarks	147
B. <i>ἄν</i> / <i>ἐάν</i>	149
C. Textual reinterpretations	149
D. The article	150
1. With proper nouns	150
2. With <i>οἱ</i> (plural)	153
3. As a relative pronoun	153
4. Absence of article	154
5. List of nations in Palestine	157
6. Articulated nouns	158
7. The Red Sea	161
8. Change in gender of article	161
E. Conjunctions	161
1. <i>καί</i> / <i>δέ</i>	161
2. Loss of conjunction	162
3. Addition of conjunction	164
4. Change of conjunction	168
F. Word order	168
1. Obviously hexaplaric	168
2. Probably hexaplaric	171
3. Involving pronouns	173
4. Disparate cases	175
G. Pronouns	182
1. Added under the asterisk	182
2. Added without an asterisk	183
3. Pronouns added contra <i>℣</i>	185
4. Genitive pronouns and coordinate nouns	186
5. Loss of original pronouns	188
6. Change in number of pronouns	190
7. Change in gender of pronouns	193
8. Change in case of pronouns	194
9. Change in person of pronouns	195
10. Change in pronominal stem	195
H. Nouns	197
1. Spelling	197
2. Change in number	198
3. Change in case	201
4. Change in gender	203
I. Numbers	203
J. Adjectival phrases	205

K. Proper nouns	207
L. Prepositions	209
1. Addition of prepositions	209
2. Omission of prepositions	212
3. Change of prepositions	214
M. Verbs	218
1. Participial variants	219
2. Change in number	220
3. Congruence with neuter plural subject	222
4. Change in person	223
5. Change in tense	223
6. Modal change	228
7. Change in voice	230
8. Aorist passive of <i>δύναμαι</i>	231
9. Hellenistic vs Classical inflections	232
N. Simplex vs compound forms	234
O. Textual expansions	238
P. Shorter texts (omissions)	251
Q. Lexemic changes in the tradition	258
Index of Passages	273

Chapter I: The Hexaplaric Recension

The Exodus text tradition is particularly suitable for studying the hexaplaric recension. The hex signs have been preserved to a large extent in Syh, and where extant, in G, as well as in some of the Arm mss. Since copyists of Arm probably had no idea as to what these signs were supposed to represent the tradition is often scrambled, the signs are confused and sometimes placed incorrectly; nonetheless the Arm tradition is a valuable new source for studying hex.

A. Since the text of Exod is substantially different from $\mathfrak{M}$ in chapters 35—40, it is particularly here that Origen's work can best be seen. Not only is Exod for these chapters substantially shorter, its text is also rearranged considerably and at times the text is quite at variance with $\mathfrak{M}$. For the correspondences in tabular form cf Einleitung C5. As a result the hex text, represented by G-58-72-376-767 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh, and in a puzzling manner by F^h, is so different from Exod that Br.-M. despaired of incorporating the O text in the large apparatus, and the text corresponding to $\mathfrak{M}$'s 368—394³ is printed in a separate appendix. This was also done for the hex addition corresponding to $\mathfrak{M}$'s 282³—28 which text, however, is more widely attested, viz. by F^a M O⁻⁷⁶⁷ C["] d n s t 630 18 46 646 Aeth^{CR} Arab Arm Syh. It should be noted as well that the passage is attributed to ϑ' in Syh (although the end of the asterisked passage is not given). When one compares 282²—26 with $\mathfrak{M}$ it is immediately evident that v.22 = v.22 in $\mathfrak{M}$; v.23 = v.29, and v.26 = v.30. Between the last two verses in Exod is a summary statement much abbreviated in which some of the contents of vv.23—28 of $\mathfrak{M}$ appears, but only as a general statement. All of this is placed under the obelus (in Syh⁴) by Origen as having no equivalent in Hebrew. At its proper place, i. e. between vv.22 and 23 he places a rendering of $\mathfrak{M}$'s vv.23—28 from ϑ' .

On a much greater scale Origen deals with the Greek text of chh.35—40. In the list below is given the overall picture of what Origen did to "correct" the LXX text of his day. Only the larger pieces of text are there given; individual words and phrases are reserved for later lists. What Origen achieves by major transpositions, additions from other columns of his hexapla under the asterisks (though some asterisks were undoubtedly lost in the tradition or misplaced), and the use of the obelus to signal Greek pieces of text not found in $\mathfrak{M}$, is a text which at least approximates the Hebrew. If the hex source for a plus is known it is given in parentheses at the end of the list of witnesses for the citation.¹⁾

¹⁾ For a thoroughgoing study of Origen's work on chh.35—40 see now Detlef Fraenkel, *Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35—40*, MSU XX (Festschrift R. Hanhart), 140—186.

- 357 fin] + (cvar; * Arm^{ms} Syh^L) και ελαιον εις το φως και αρωματα εις το ελαιον της χρисεως και εις το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως O⁻⁵⁸ 131^{mg} d 127 t 121^{mg} 128'-628 55 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3510 καί 4°] pr (* Arm^{ms}vid; + * 344) και τας σανιδας (cvar) αυτης (sub * Arm^{ms} Syh^L; > 58) F^b O 85^{mg}-130^{mg}-321'^{mg}-344^{mg} Arab Arm Syh (σ' θ' κ. τ. σαν. 344; σ' θ' αυτης Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3510 fin] + (* Arm^{ms}vid) και τας βασεις αυτης (sub * Arm^{ms} Syh^L; > 58) F^b O Arab Arm Syh (θ' 344)
- 3515 τράπεζαν] + και τους αναφορεις αυτης F^b Aeth^C Arab = **℞** | αὐτῆς] + και τους αρτους του προσωπου 376 Arab = **℞**; + (* Arm^{ms}) και (> 767 Syh) το συσκιαζον την τραπεζαν και τους αναφορεις αυτης και παντα τα σκευη αυτης και τους αρτους του προσωπου (και 2° — προσ. sub * Syh^L; + κ Syh^T; om και ult — fin 72) 72-767 Arm Syh: cf **℞**
- 3516 fin] + (cvar; * Syh^L) και τους λυχνους αυτης και το ελαιον του φωτος και το θυσιαστηριον του θυμιαματος και τους αναφορεις αυτου F^b 72-376 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh: cf **℞** (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3517 καί 1°] pr (cvar) και το ελαιον του χρισματος και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως και το επισπαστρον της θυρας της σκηνης F O'-29 C'' d⁻⁴⁴ s^{-30'} t 318 128' 46 59 319 509 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
- 3517 θυσιαστήριον] + (cvar; * Syh^L) της ολοκαυτωσεως (+ * 344) και το κοσκινωμα το χαλκουν το αυτου τους αναφορεις αυτου F^b O 85^{mg}-130^{mg}-344^{mg} Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3517 fin] + (cvar) και (sub * Syh^L) τον λουτρηρα και την βασιν αυτου και τα ιστια της αυλης και τους στυλους αυτης και τας βασεις αυτης και το επισπαστρον της πυλης της αυλης και τους πασσαλους της σκηνης και τους πασσαλους της αυλης και τα περισσα αυτων (και 3° — αυτων sub * Syh^L) F^b O⁻⁵⁸ 85^{mg}-130^{mg}-344^{mg} Latcodd 91 94—96 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (και 1° σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3523 βύσσος] pr (cvar) βακινθος (sub * Syh) και πορφυρα και κοκκινον αλλοιουμενον (> A 58-82 b 121; νακ. — αλλ. sub. * Arm^{ms}) και A O-82 b 121 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' 344; σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3528 καί 2°] pr (* Arm^{ms}; + * Syh) και το ελαιον (+ κ Syh^T mend) εις το φως O⁻⁷² 318 126-128'-628 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3535 ὑφάναι — βύσσῳ] (cvar; * Arm^{ms}) εν τη βακινθῳ (εν τη υ. sub * Syh^T) και εν τη πορφυρα και (εν 1° — και 2° sub * Syh^L) εν τῷ κοκκινῷ τῷ αλλοιουμενῷ (τω αλλ. sub * Syh^L) και τη βυσσω υφαναι O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 368 τὰς — (40) fin] pr και ειποισεν (aut -σαν) et post 3913 fin tr F^b O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 3633 κώδωνας 2°] + (* Arm^{ms}) ανα μεσον (α. μ. sub * Syh) των ροισκων O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 372 fin] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) [368] τό — [34] fin F^b O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 373 ὑφαντόν] + (* G) ειποισεν αυτο F^b O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 378 fin] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) και οι κοσμοι (κρικοι F^b) των στυλων (αυτων pro τ. στ. F^b) και αι ψαλιδες αυτων αργυραι F^b O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 379 είκοσι 2°] + (χαλκαι) + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) και οι κοσμοι των στυλων και αι κατακολλησεις (cvar) αυτων αργυραι O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3710 fin] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) και οι κοσμοι (κρικοι F^b) των στυλων (αυτων pro τ. στ. F^b) και αι (> 767) κολλησεις (cvar) αυτων αργυραι F^b O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 3715 καί 2°] pr (* Arm^{ms} Syh) και αι ψαλιδες (οι κρικοι pro αι ψ. F^b) των στυλων F^b O⁻⁵⁸ Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 381 fin] + (cvar; * G Arm^{ms} Syh) εκ ξυλων ασηπτων δυο πηχεων και ημισους το μηκος αυτης και πηχεος και ημισους το πλατος αυτης και πηχεος και ημισους το υψος αυτης A F^b F^b O 118'-537 121 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 384 ὥστε] pr (cvar; * G Syh) και ειποισεν αναφορεις εκ ξυλων ασηπτων και κατεχυρωσεν αυτους χρυσιω και εισηνεγκεν τους αναφορεις εις τους δακτυλιους επι τοις πλευροις της κιβωτου F^b O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 385 fin] + (cvar; * G Arm^{ms} Syh) δυο πηχεων και ημισους μηκος αυτου και πηχεος και ημισους το πλατος αυτου F^b O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})

- 386 χρυσοῦς] (× G Arm^{ms}) χρυσα O 44 I fin] + (cvar; × G Arm^{ms} Syh) τορευτα εποιησεν
 387 αυτα εξ αμφοτερων των μερων του ιλαστηριου O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 fin] + (cvar; × Arm^{ms} Syh; + × G) εκ του ιλαστηριου εποιησεν τους χερουβειμ εξ αμφο-
 388 τερων των μερων αυτου και εγενοντο οι χερουβειμ εκτεινοντες τας πτερυγας επανωθεν O
 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 388 fin] + (cvar) κατα προσωπον αυτων ανηρ προς τον αδελφον αυτου επι το ιλαστηριον ησαν τα
 389 προσωπα των χερουβειμ (+ ✗ G; ανηρ — χερ. sub ✗ Syh^T; αυτου—χερ. sub ✗ Syh^L) G-
 376-767 Arab Syh (θ' ανηρ—χερ. Syh^{txt})
 389 τήν 2° — (11) fin] ἐκ — (11) fin sub ÷ Syh^L; sub ÷ G Arm^{ms}(vid) Syh^T; > F^h Aeth^C Arab
 = **℞**
 3811 fin] + (× G Syh) [3710b] εκ ξυλων — [15] fin F^h O-58 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh ([10] δύο —
 (12) fin sub ✗ Arm^{ms}vid)
 3813 init — (17) fin] sub ÷ Arm^{ms}; ἦ — (17) fin sub ÷ G Syh; om ἦ — (17) fin F^h Aeth^C Arab
 = **℞**
 3817 fin] + [3717b] εκ χρυσιου — [28] fin F^h O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh ([17b] εκ — [24] fin sub ✗
 Arm^{ms} Syh; [17b] εκ — [21] τοῦς sub ✗ G I [25] τὸ χρυσοῦν] του (> Compl) θυμιαματος
 3818 F^h Aeth^C = Compl **℞**; > F^h Arab I [25] εκ — [28] fin sub ✗ Arm^{ms} Syh)
 3818 om init — (21) fin F^h O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = **℞**
 3822 init — (24) fin] post (25) fin tr F^h O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3822 init — συναγωγῆς] pr ÷ Syh^L; sub ÷ Arm^{ms} Syh^T; cf **℞** I fin] + (cvar; × Arm^{ms} Syh)
 3822 εκ ξυλων ασηπτων πεντε πηχεων μηκος αυτου και πεντε πηχεων ευρος αυτου τετραγωνον και
 3822 τριων πηχεων υψος αυτου (+ και F^h Aeth^C = **℞**) εποιησεν τα κερατα αυτου επι των τεσ-
 3822 σαρων γωνεων αυτου εξ αυτου ησαν τα κερατα αυτου και εκαλυψεν αυτο χαλκω F^h O-58
 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 3823 fin] + (× Arm Syh; + και Arm) παντα τα σκευη αυτου εποιησεν (> Arm^{ap}) χαλκα F^h O-58
 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 3824 μοχλοῖς] + (cvar; × Arm^{ms} Syh) και εποιησεν τους αναφορεις ξυλα ασηπτα και εκαλυψεν
 3824 αυτους χαλκω F^h O-58 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 3824 ὥστε] pr (cvar) και εισηνεγκεν τους αναφορεις εις τους δακτυλιους επι τα πλευρα του θυ-
 3824 σιαστηριου F^h O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3824 fin] + (cvar; × Arm^{ms} Syh^T) κοilon σανιδωτον εποιησεν αυτο (+ ✗ Syh^L) F^h O-58 Aeth^C
 Arab Arm Syh
 3827 om comma F^h O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh, sed cf 4026 fin infra
 392 σίκλοι] + (× G Arm^{ms} Syh) εν τω σικλω τω αγιω O-58 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = **℞** (θ'
 392 Syh^{txt}); + κατα τον σικλον τον αγιον F^h
 398 τοῦ μαρτυρίου] sub ✗ Arm^{ms} (mend); + (× G Arm^{ms}vid Syh) και το θυσιαστηριον το χαλ-
 398 κουν (om το χ. 58'-767 Aeth) O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 399 comma] post (10) θυσιαστηρίου 2° tr O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3910 καὶ 3° — (12) fin] ante (14) init tr O-G Arab Arm Syh
 3912 comma] sub ÷ Arm^{ms}; ; χρυσίον — fin sub ÷ Syh; > Compl = **℞**
 3914 αὐτῆς 1°] + (× Arm^{ms} Syh) περνας (cvar) αὐτῆς (> Arm) και σανιδας αὐτῆς O-58 Aeth^C
 Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 3914 fin] + (cvar) και τας διφθερας δερματα κριων ηρυθροδανωμενα και τα καλυμματα δερματα
 3914 νακινθινα και το καταπετασμα το συσκιαζον (και ult — συσκ. sub ✗ Arm^{ms} Syh) O Aeth^C
 Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 3917 καύσεως] + (× Arm^{ms} Syh) και παντα τα σκευη αὐτῆς (+ ✗ G) O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3917 (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
 3919 comma] pr (cvar; × G Arm^{ms} Syh^L) και τας στολας τας λειτουργικας λειτουργειν εν τω αγιω
 3919 O Arab Arm Syh; post (21) fin tr O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3920 init] pr και το θυσιαστηριον το χρυσουν (και — χρυσουν sub ✗ G Arm^{ms} Syh) και το
 3920 ελαιον της χρисεως και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως και το επισπαστρον της θυρας της σκηνης και
 3920 το θυσιαστηριον το χαλκουν και το παραθεμα το χαλκουν το αυτω τους αναφορεις αυτου (της
 3920 4° — αυτου sub ✗ G Arm^{ms}vid; και 4° — αυτου sub ✗ Syh) και παντα τα σκευη αυτου τον
 3920 λουτρηρα και την βασιν αυτου (τον — fin sub ✗ G Arm^{ms}vid Syh) O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3920 (οί γ' και 1° — χρυσουν 1° Syh^{txt}; σ' θ' τον — fin Syh^{txt})
 3921 om init — ἐπικαλύμματα O(-G) Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 406 fin] + (cvar; × G Arm^{ms} Syh) και θησεις τον λουτρηρα ανα μεσον της σκηνης του μαρτυριου

- και ανα μεσον του θυσιαστηριου και δωσεις εκει υδωρ και θησεις την αυλην κυκλω και δωσεις
το επισπαστρον της πυλης της αυλης O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
407 και 3° — αὐτήν] sub ÷ Arm^{ms} Syh: contra $\mathfrak{M}$; >71' 426; + $\leftarrow$ G
409 fin] + ... $\leftarrow$ G (sub *); + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) και χρισεις τον λουτρηα και την βασιν αυτου και
αγιασεις αυτον (eos Arab) F^b O-G Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (oi γ' Syh^{txt})
4018 fin] + (cvar; * G Syh^L) και εθηκεν (κ. εθ. sub * Arm^{ms}) το ιλαστηριον επι της κιβωτου
επανωθεν O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
4025 Μωυση] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh^L) και εθηκεν το επισπαστρον της θυρας της σκηνης (+ $\leftarrow$ G)
O-58 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
4026 σκηνης] + (cvar) της σκεπης (τ. σκ. sub * G Arm^{ms} Syh) του μαρτυριου και ανηνεγκεν επι
αυτου την ολοκαυτωσιν και την θυσιαν (και 1° — θυσ. sub * G Arm^{ms} Syh) καθα ενετει-
λατο $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ τω μωυση και εποισεν τον λουτρηα ανα μεσον της σκηνης του μαρτυριου και ανα με-
σον του θυσιαστηριου και εδωκεν εκει υδωρ (μαρτυριον 2° — υδωρ sub * Syh^T; ανα 1° —
υδωρ sub * G Arm^{ms} Syh^L) ινα νιπτωνται εξ αυτου μωυσης και ααρων και οι υιοι αυτου τας
χειρας αυτων και τους ποδας εισπορευομενων αυτων εις την σκηνην του μαρτυριου η οταν προσ-
πορευονταν προς το θυσιαστηριον λειτουργειν (sub ÷ G Arm^{ms} Syh; >58 = $\mathfrak{M}$) ενι-
πτοντο εξ αυτου (εξ α. sub ÷ Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$) καθαπερ συνεταξεν $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ τω μωυση O Aeth^C Arab
Arm Syh (θ' ανα 1° — υδωρ Syh^{txt}): cf 3826–27
4027 θυσιαστηρίου] + (* G Arm^{ms} Syh^L) και εθηκεν το επισπαστρον (καταπετασμα F^b) της
(> F^b) πυλης (-λην F^b) της αυλης F^b O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh

Certain remarks on the materials presented in the above list are in order. First of all, the tradition of the hex signs has been quite imperfectly transmitted. At 3510 (1° et 2°) the tradition is unclear for Arm^{ms}, some apparently having the entire plus intended by the marginal asterisk, others including only the pronoun *αυτης*. At v. 15 the correct hex text can be restored through the use of the Syh tradition. Exod has only “and the table and all its vessels.” Syh has *και την τράπεζαν* under the obelus, and adds to *συσκιαζον* (for $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ of v. 12; v. 15 = v. 13 in $\mathfrak{M}$), then repeats “the table,” and adds “and its staves and all its vessels and the bread of the presence,” with the latter addition under the asterisk. Of course a metobelus before and an asterisk after “and all its vessels” have been lost in the tradition. At v. 17 the signs have been lost in the tradition for the first citation; for the second one 344^{ms} has the asterisk at the wrong place and lacks a metobelus, and at the last one the tradition leaves “the laver and its basin” outside the asterisk tradition in Syh. At v. 23 Arm^{ms} correctly presents the asterisk tradition; Syh does not. And at v. 35 Arm^{ms} have too much text under the asterisk. Syh^L correctly designates εν 1° — και 2° and τω αλλοιουμενω as hex plusses. Note that the θ' text also transposed *υφαινειν* to the end to designate the $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$ of $\mathfrak{M}$. This nicely shows that θ' was not an independent translation but rather a revision of LXX; no new translation would have failed to render the conjunction; θ', however, simply reordered the text using the existing infinitive of the text before him.

At 3633 Syh has the metobelus in the wrong place, i.e. after *μεσον* instead of after *ροισκων*. At 386 G and an Arm^{ms} wrongly include *χρυσα* under the asterisk. At v. 7 G lacks the metobelus, and at v. 8 Syh^T has the asterisk at the wrong place. At v. 9 only Syh^L has the obelus tradition correctly defined. The long addition at v. 11 is correctly delimited in G Syh but apparently not so in the margin of an Arm^{ms}. In v. 13 the beginning of the passage without a Hebrew counterpart is wrongly given in Arm^{ms} as well. The lengthy addition at the end of 3817 is not correctly defined in any

of our sources, whereas in v.22(2°) only Arm^{mss} and Syh^T correctly designate the verse under the obelus (as well as the addition under the asterisk). At v.24(2°) the sign tradition has been lost, and for 3° Syh^L has only a metobelus.

At 39^s Arm^{mss} incorrectly show the extent of the hex reading, whereas G and Syh have the asterisk at the wrong place. At v.12 Arm^{mss}, but not Syh, correctly place the obelus at the beginning of the verse. At v.20 none of the signs is correctly placed and at 40^{is} an Arm^{mss} has only *και εθηκεν* under the asterisk and the long addition at the end of v.26 should have been entirely placed under the asterisk instead of the scattered signs present in the tradition.

Origen not only added text which was lacking in the Greek; he also tried to straighten out the order of the text by rearrangement. These transpositions are found in the above list at 36^s 38²² and 39¹⁰.

It will also have been observed that Origen's source for the hex plusses (and probably for the transpositions as well) was mainly *θ'*. Exceptions include *και* 1° at 35¹⁷fin attributed to Symmachus, and the Syh tradition of Symmachus at 35²³, though 344 has *θ'*. At 40^s the plus is attributed to *οι γ'* in Syh.

That Origen used *θ'* to revise LXX in these chapters has in the past been assumed to be correct; cf e.g. K. G. O'Connell (1972). This assumption has been challenged by D. Fraenkel who has shown that the so-called Theodotionic additions are quite foreign to the vocabulary and translation style of *θ'* elsewhere in the book. What Fraenkel has demonstrated is that Origen made his own revised text using the hex text of Exod A²) which he transformed into a fitting conclusion to the full tabernacle account. What Fraenkel has to my mind not explained adequately is the source of the *θ'* (and other) designations in Syh, but for the rest his statement is compelling, and students of Exod B will in the future have to take his argument into account.

B. In *List 2* the remaining asterisk tradition of the Exodus text is given. The materials are throughout considered to be = *ℳ*, and that fact is not noted; the symbol *ℳ* in this list stands for the text of BHS, i.e. divergences in *ℳ*^{mss} Sam or Tar are disregarded. When the asterisk tradition is clearly wrong it is marked *mend* (for mendose) or "contra *ℳ*." As in *List 1*, where a hex source is given somewhere in the tradition it is given in parentheses at the end of the citation.

List 2

- 15 *ψυχαι*] + (※ 64 Syh); + *των* 376 Syh) *εξελθοντων* (-*θωντων* 376) O⁻⁷²-15-64^{mss} Syh; + *αι εξελθουσαι* 72 *f* 318^{mss} Arm Co
- 111 *και 'Ραμεσσή*] ※ *et lr'ms'* Syh^T; *και* sub ※ Syh^L | *'Ραμεσσή*] pr *την* O⁻⁷²-15 126 527 76. *ℳ* has *וַיָּאֶחַז רַעְמֶסֶס* and obviously the asterisk must have been intended by Origen for *την*.
- 114 *εργα*] + (※ 64 Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτων* O⁻⁵⁸-15-64^{mss} Arm Syh
- 121 *εποίησαν*] pr (※ Syh) *και* O-15-707 130 646 Arm^{ap} Syh (*α'* M 85-127-344)

²) For the designation Exod A&B cf ch. VI below.

- 23 *ἔλαβεν*] pr ✱ *ei* ✱ Syh; + *αὐτω* (cvar) B F O⁻⁴²⁶-15' *b d* 56'-129 *x γ*⁻¹²¹ 68'-120' 55 59 130 799 Latcod 100 = **ℳ**. A large number of witnesses including some attesting to the plus above have transposed *αὐτό* post *κρύπτειν*, i.e. thereby equalling the Syh word order
- 23 *θίβιν*] + (✱ Arm^{mss} Syh) *παπυρου* 15-376' 527 Arm Syh (*α' vid θ'*)
- 26 *παιδίον*] pr (✱ Syh) *το* 376 128' Arm Syh
- 26 *idem*] + (✱ 64) *και ιδου παιδιον* F^b 64^{ms} = **ℳ**: + *והנה נער*; + (✱ Syh) *και ην το παιδιον* 376 630 Arm Syh
- 214 *κατέστησεν*] + (✱ 64 Arm^{mss} Syh) *εις ανδρα* 64^{ms}-426 Arm^{ap} Syh (*α' θ' Syh^{txt}*); + ✱ *vi-rum* Arm^{te}
- 216 *ἐπτά θυγατέρες*] + (✱ Syh) *ησαν* O⁻⁴²⁶ Syh (*σ' Syh^{txt}*): contra **ℳ**
- 219 *ἤντηλσεν*] pr (✱ 64 Syh) *αντλων* O⁻⁷²-64^{ms} Syh
- 222 *fin*] + (cvar; ✱ M 85-344-730; ~ 343) *το δε ονομα του δευτερον εκλεξεσεν ελιζερ ο γαρ θεος του πατρος μου βοηθος μου και ερυσατο με εκ χειρος φαραω* F M O⁻³⁷⁶-29' C'' *b d f*^{-56^{txt}} *n s t x* 121^{ms}-318' 630 18 55 59 130 799 Latcod 100 Arab Bo Syh^{LmsT}: contra **ℳ**: ex 184
- 32 *του*] pr (✱ 64 Arm^{mss} Syh) *μεσου* O⁻⁷²-64^{ms} 128 Arm Syh
- 34 *ἐκ*] + (✱ 64) *μεσου* O⁻⁷²-64^{ms}(*vid*) 128' Eus VI 236 241 Arm Syh
- 35 *τὸ ὑπόδημα*] *τα υποδηματα σου* (sub ✱ Arm^{mss}) Carl 49 Aeth Arm = **ℳ**; + (✱ Syh) *σου* 58^{ms}-135-376'-618 Syh (*οί γ' Syh^{txt}*)
- 35 *ἔστηκας*] + (✱ Arm^{mss} Syh) *επ αυτου* O⁻⁷² Carl 49 Eus II 18 VI 241 Arm Syh (*α' Syh^{txt}*)
- 37 *ἐργοδιωκτῶν*] + (✱ Syh) *αυτων* O Arm Syh
- 311 *εἰμι*] pr (✱ Syh) *εγω* 58-376 128' Syh (*α' θ' Syh^{txt}*); + (✱ Arm^{ms}) *εγω* A^c B F^b 15'-172-135*-426-*ol* 126-550' *b n*⁻⁶²⁸ 527 55 130 509 ClemR XVII 5 Cyr Ad 240 Tht Ex 112 II 500 Latcod 100 Arm Sa. **ℳ** hab אָנכִי.
- 316 *οὖν*] sub ✱ 64^{ms}(mend)
- 46 *τὴν χεῖρα* 1° 73 *b* 129 *n*⁻⁶²⁸ *x* Latcod 101 Concil (Cyr) I 5] *αυτην* 107'-125; + (✱ Arm^{mss}) *αυτου* 843 rell
- 46 *αὐτοῦ ult*] + (✱ Syh) *λερωσα* 376' *d*⁻⁴⁴ *f*⁻¹²⁹ *t* 71 392-527 76' 130 509 799 Cyr Ad 245 Gl 472 Or IV 462 Latcod 101 Aug Loc in hept II 17 Ruf Ex XII 3 Arab Arm Bo Syh (*α' θ'* 85-127-344)
- 47 *τὴν χεῖρα*] + (✱ Syh) *αυτου* A O-29-618 52'-78-126-313'-414*-422 106 53' *n*⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ *t γ* 59 Cyr Ad 245 Gl 472 Or IV 462 Latcod 100 Arm Co Syh (*ὁ ἔβρ' Syh^{txt}*)
- 49 *αἶμα*] pr (✱ Syh) *και εσται* 426 Syh (*σ' θ' Syh^{txt}*)
- 410 *ισχνόφωνος*] + (✱ Syh) *γαρ* O 343 128' Latcod 100 Ambr Abr II 73 Arm Syh
- 419 *οἱ*] pr (✱ Arm^{mss} Syh) *οι ανδρες* (*ανῶι* 72) O Arm Syh
- 420 *παιδιά*] + (✱ Arm Syh) *αυτου* (*εαυτου* 58 318) F^b O C'' 318 Aeth Arab Arm^{te} Co Syh (*σ' Syh^{txt}*)
- 422 *υἱός*] + (✱ Syh) *μου* 426 Ach Sa Syh (*οί γ' (ὁ ἔβρ' l) Syh^{txt}*)
- 423 *ἐγώ*] + (✱ Syh) *εμι* O⁻⁷² Syh: **ℳ** hab אָנכִי (*α' θ' Syh^{txt}*)
- 423 *πρωτότοκον*] + (✱ Syh) *σου* O⁻⁷² Co Syh (*οί γ' (ὁ ἔβρ' l) Syh^{txt}*)
- 425 *αὐτῆς*] sub ✱ Arm^{mss} Syh (mend)
- 428 *ἀπέστειλεν*] + (✱ Arm^{mss}) *αυτον* (*αυτω* 376) O⁽⁻⁷²⁾ Aeth Arab Arm Syh
- 56 *Φαραώ*] + (✱ Arm^{mss} Syh) *εν τη ημερα εκεινη* O 131^c 128' Arm Syh (*ὁ ἔβρ' Syh^{Ltxt}*)
- 56 *γραμματαυσιν*] + (✱ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* F^b O 131^c Arm Syh
- 58 *κεκράγασιν*] pr (✱ Syh) *αυτοι* 376' C'' 318 646 Syh (*α' θ' Syh^{txt}*)
- 512 *Αἰγύπτῳ*] pr (✱ Syh) *γη* B M O⁻⁶⁴*72-29 19' 321 *γ*⁻³⁹² 18 55 59 130 799 Latcod 100 Arab Arm Syh
- 514 *τῆς πλυνθείας*] pr ✱ 85 (mend)
- 520 *Μωυσῇ*] pr ✱ *in* ✱ Syh (*σ' θ' Syh^{txt}*); pr *τω* 527: **ℳ** hab pr נַח
- 523 *καί 2°*] pr ✱ Syh (mend); + (Arm^{mss} Syh) *ουομενος* 58-376 128' Arm Syh (*α' θ' Syh^{txt}*)
- 63 *Ἰσαάκ*] pr (✱ Syh) *προς* 15-58-376 318 Eus IV 130 Syh (*οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt}*)
- 63 (*καί*) *Ἰακώβ*] *καί* sub ✱ Syh (mend); pr (✱ Syh) *προς* 15-376 Eus IV 130 Syh (*οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt}*)
- 67 *λαόν*] pr (✱ Arm^{mss} Syh) *εις* F^a M 15-58-135-376 19' *s x* 318-527 18 646 Latcod 100 Ambr Cain II 10 Arm Bo Syh (*οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt}*)
- 613 *πρός 2°*] pr (✱ Arm^{mss} Syh^T; + ✱ Syh^L) *προς τους* (> F^b) *υιους* *ιηλ* και F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15 Arm Syh (*σ' θ' Syh^{txt}*)

- 616 ἐπτά] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) ετη 29' b 107' 664 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t γ⁻³¹⁸ Ach Arm Bo^A Sa Syh
71 σου 2°] (+ ※ Arm^{mss}) σοι 130 Cyr IX 77 Tht IV 121 Aeth Arab Arm Co: contra 𐤎
73 τέρατα] + (※ Syh) μου A F^b O-15 761 b 30'-321 84 x 318' 120'-128' 130 646' LatAug
Ex 18 Aeth Arab Co Syh (ὁ ἔβρ' Syh^{txt})
77 ἐτῶν 2°] pr *filius* (sub ※^{mss}) Arm: cf 𐤎
77 ὀγδοήκοντα 2°] pr ※ *filius* ✗ Syh (α')
- 85 ἁρῶν] pr (※ Syh) πρὸς 426 Syh
85 fin] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν αἰγυπτου F^a O'-15 108^{ms} Arm Syh (α' σ' Syh^T; σ' θ'
Syh^L)
86 χεῖρα] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) αὐτου O-58-15 527 Aeth Arm Bo^A Sa Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
89 καὶ 4° — ὕμῶν] sub ※ 343(vid); > 53': contra 𐤎
810 κυρίου] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) ὁ θς ἡμων O-15 Arm Syh (α' σ' θ' Syh^L)
816 Αἰγύπτου] + (※ Arm^{mss}) καὶ ἐποίησαν οὕτως 15-376 128' Arm = 𐤎; + (※ Syh^T) καὶ
ἐποίησεν οὕτως (sub ※ Syh^L) O-376 Latcod 106 Syh
819 καθάπερ] *secundum* ※ *quod* ✗ Syh: 𐤎 hab כד
821 κυνόμενιαν] pr (※ Syh) τὴν 58-426 Syh (σ' Syh^{txt})
829 καὶ 4°] pr ※ 85 (mend)
98 πασάτω] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) αὐτην O-15 C'' 318 verss
90 ἐναντίον] pr (※ Syh) καὶ ἐστήσαν O-15 Pal Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
920 συνήγαγεν] + (※ Syh) τοὺς παιδὰς αὐτου (αὐτῶ 552; > 72 730) καὶ O-15 C'' 730 318
128' 646 Arm Pal Syh (α' ὁ' θ' + τοὺς δούλους αὐτοῦ 108 Syh)
921 ἀφῆκεν] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) τοὺς παιδὰς αὐτου καὶ O-15 Arm Pal Syh
921 κτήνη] + (※ Syh) αὐτου O-15 799 Tht Ex 115^{ap} LatAug Ex 33 Aeth Arab Arm^{te} Co Pal
Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
922 τὴν 2°] ※ *campi* ✗ Syh; + ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ O-376 Arm Pal: 𐤎 hab כהן
922 fin] + (※ Syh) αἰγυπτου O-72-15 500 Arm Pal Syh
923 χεῖρα] + (※ Syh) αὐτου O-376-15-707 C'' 53' 646 LatRuf Ex IV 3 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh
924 ἐν 2°] (※ Syh) ἐν παση (+ τη 72 130) γῇ (τη 58) O-15 318' 130 799 Arm Pal Syh (α'
Syh^{txt})
925 ἀπό] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) πάντα (> 106 318) ὅσα (> 527) ἦν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ (cvar) B^{ms} M^{ms}
O-15-135^{ms}-707 b d n⁻⁶²⁸ t x γ⁻¹²¹ 55 Latcod 104 Arab Arm Bo^B Pal Syh (θ' Syh)
930 κύριον] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) θῷ 15-426 Arm Syh (σ' Syh^L)
935 τῷ] (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^T) ἐν χειρὶ O-15 Arm Pal Syh (α' σ' Syh^{txt})
101 τῶν] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) τὴν καρδίαν O-72-15 b 107' n 85^{ms}-344^{ms} t Arm Bo^B Pal Sa Syh
109 πρεσβυτέρους] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) ἡμων (υμ. 15*) O'-64^{txt}-15 125 458 318 Cyr Ad 201 IV
264 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
109 νίοις] + (※ Syh) ἡμων (υμ. 15*) O-15 527 Cyr Ad 201^R Aeth Arab Co Pal Syh (α' θ'
Syh^{txt})
109 θυγατέραςιν] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) ἡμων O-15 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
109 προβάτοις] + (※ Syh) ἡμων O-58-15 Aeth Arab Co Pal Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
109 ἡμῶν 1°] + (※ 64 Arm^{mss} Syh) πορευσομεθα 15-58-64^{ms}-376 C'' 318 Arm Syh
1011 fin] + (※ 64) καὶ λεγουσιν αὐτοῖς πορευεσθε (π[... 64) 64^{ms} 318: contra 𐤎
1012 γῆν 2°] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) αἰγυπτου 15-376'-707 19' 246 127 30' t 392-527 Latcod
104(vid) Arm Pal Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
1013 ῥάβδον] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) αὐτου O-15 246 527 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh (ὁ ἔβρ'
Syh^{Ltxt})
1014 γέγονεν] + ※ *talis* ✗ Syh
1014 οὕτως] sub ※ Arm^{mss} (mend)
1015 τὴν] pr (※ Arm^{mss}) πασαν 53' Arm: non hab 𐤎 sed cf 2° infra
1015 τῆς γῆς 1°] pr (※ Syh) πασης 15-376' Sa Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
1021 χεῖρα M 64^{txt}-135-707-708 106-107 127 30-343' 370 x 18 55 130 509 LatAug Ex 38] + (※
Arm^{mss}) σου rell
1024 κυρίῳ] sub ※ Arm^{mss} (mend)
1024 προβάτων] + (※ 64 Arm^{mss} Syh) ὑμων O-58-15-64^{ms} 318 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh (οἱ
γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
1024 βοῶν] + (※ 64 Syh) ὑμων O-72-15-64^{ms}-135 C''-552 318 18 646 Aeth Arab Bo Pal Syh (οἱ
γ' Syh^{txt})

- 1029 *εἴρηκας*] pr (※ Syh) *οὕτως* 108^c 128' Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 111 *fin*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *εντευθεν* O-72-15 18 Arm Pal Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 112 *πλησίον* 1°] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O-15 126 246 75 128' verss (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ttxt})
 112 *πλησίον* 2°] + (※ 64 Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτης* O-15-64^{mg}-381' C'' 246 46 318 128' 646' verss (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ttxt})
 112 *καί* 3°] pr ※ Syh^T (mend); + (※ Syh) *σκευη* 15-376' 127 30' t 527 Arm Bo^B Pal Sa Syh. Arm^{mss} hab *χρυσᾶ* sub ※ mend pro *σκευη*.
 113 *αὐτοῦ* 2°] + (※ Syh; ÷ Arm^{mss} mend) *και εν οφθαλμοις* (+ *παντος* 527) *του λαου* O-15 392-527 128' Latcod 101 Arm Pal Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 115 *θρόνου*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O-15 246 392-527 128' Tht I 1917 Arm Pal Sa Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 117 *καί* B 82' b f-246 x 392 120-128' 130 799 Sa] sub ※ Syh^T (mend); + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *ανα* (> 126) *μεσον* (aut -σων) rell (θ' Syh^{txt})
 121 *Ἀαρών*] pr ※ *ad* ✗ Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 123 *λαβέτωσαν*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *εαυτοις* O-15 131^{c2} LatCyp Quir II 15 PsNic Pascha 1 Aeth Arm Bo Syh
 124 *γείτονα*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* 15-426 131^c Arm Co Syh (οἱ γ' (ό εβρ' L) Syh^{txt}); + *εαυτου* 58-376
 126 *της τεσσαρεσκαίδεκάτης*] pr ※ *diei* ✗ Syh; + (※ Arm^{mss}) *ημερας* (-ρα 376) O-15 84^{mg} LatGreg II Tr 9 PsAug Serm Cai I 31.2 PsCyp Pascha 1 Arm (α' σ' θ' Syh^L)
 129 *οὐδέ*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *εφθον* O-72-15 Arm Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 129 *κεφαλὴν*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* O-72-15 Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 129 *ποσίν*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* 15-376' Aeth Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 129 *ἐνδοσθίοις*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* 15-72-426 131^c Arm Sa Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 1214 *μνημόσυνον*] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *εις* O-15 f-246 318 PsHipp Pascha 127 Arm Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 1214 *κυρίῳ*] pr ※ Arm^{mss}; pr (※ Syh) *τω* O-15 x Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 1226 *fin*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *υμιν* (cvar) O-15 C'' 318 Or IV 422 Arm Syh (α' σ' Syh^{txt})
 1229 *θρόνου*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O-15 318 128' LatHi Helv 10 Arab Arm Sa Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 1230 *καί* 2°] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτος* O-72-15 Arm Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 1232 *πρόβατα*] + (※ Syh) *υμων* O-72-15-707 d-125 n t x 318-527 Aeth Arab Co Pal Syh (οἱ γ' (ό εβρ' L) Syh^{txt})
 1234 *ὧμων*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτων* Fb O-15 131^c n-628 30' 527 76' Latcod 101 Aug Loc in hept V 73 Gaud VII 12 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 1235 *καί* 2°] + (※ Arm^{mss}) *σκευη* 15-58-426 527 Arm Co Pal Syh
 1241 *ἐτη*] + *και εγενετο εν δυναμει της ημερας ταυτης* Fb = 𐤌; + (※ Syh) *και εγενετο εν τη* (om εν τη 376) *ημερα ταυτη* 376' Syh
 1248 *κυρίῳ*] sub ※ Syh (mend); pr (※ Syh) *τω* O-72-15 Syh; 𐤌 hab ליהו (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 1250 *οἱ*] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^T) *παντες* Fb O-15 318 Arab Arm Pal Syh
 138 *ἐξ*] *εκ γης* (sub ※ Syh mend) 15-426 n 30'-85'^{txt}-343' 527 130 Latcod 104 Aeth^P Arab Bo Syh: contra 𐤌
 1311 *ὧμοσεν*] + (※ Syh) *σοι* (sub ※ Arm^{mss}; σε 44) *και* Fb O-15-707 d(-125) n t x 392 Arm Syh (ό εβρ' Syh^{Ttxt})
 1312 *πάν* 2°] pr (※ Arm^{mss}; + ※ Syh) *και* O-72-15 52'-761 19' 246 30 Arm Syh
 1321 *πυρός*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *του φαινειν αυτοις οδευειν* (> 58' 131) *ημερας και νυκτος* O-15 131^c 128'-628 Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
 149 *ἱππεῖς*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* 15-72-426-707 C'' 53'-56'^{etc2}-246 318 Arm Co Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ttxt})
 1410 *ὀφθαλμοῖς*] + (※ Syh) *αυτων* Fb O-58-15 d t Arm Co Syh (οἱ γ' Syh^{Ttxt})
 1411 *ἐξαγαγών* B 58-82 422 19' 56^c-129-664 120-128'-628 Or IV 153] -γειν 68'; *εξαγων* 53; *εξ.* (cvar) *ημας* (υμ. 25; sub ※ Syh) Fb rell (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 1417 *ἄρμασιν*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O-58 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh^L (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 1418 *ἄρμασιν*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* 376'-707 128'-628 verss (οἱ γ' Syh^{txt})
 1418 *ἵπποις*] pr (※ Syh; ÷ 85 mend) *εν* (> 44 318 Co) *τοις* Fb M^{mg} O-72-15-82'-381' C'' 19' 44-107' 53' n s t x 318-527 z 46 76' 509 Arab Arm Co Pal Syh
 1419 *ὀπισθεν*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτων* Fb O-58-15 Eus VI 235 LatRuf Ex V 4 verss

- 1421 *χεῖρα*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* O-15 59 Eus VI 98 verss (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1422 *δεξιῶν*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτων* F^b 15-426 318' Aeth Arm Pal Syh (*α' σ' Syh^{Text}*)
1422 *εὐανύμων*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτων* F^b 15-376' 318 Aeth Arm Bo Pal Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1423 *ἄρματα*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* O-58-15 318 Aeth Arm Co Pal Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1426 *τούς 1°*] pr (※ Syh) *επι* 376' Aeth Bo Pal Syh
1427 *χεῖρα*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* O-15 527 59 verss (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1429 *δεξιῶν*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτων* 15-426 318 Arm Sa Syh
1429 *εὐανύμων*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτων* 15-376'-707 318 Arm Syh (*α' θ' Syh^{Text}*)
151 *ἀναβάτην*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* 15 Aeth Arm Syh (*οἱ γ' (ὁ ἐβρ' L) Syh^{Text}*)
152 *σκεπαστής*] + (※ Syh; + ※ Arm^{ms}) *μου* *ἡς* 376 131^{mg} Eus II 830 ^{Lat}codd 410 411 Ild
Bapt 101 Arm Syh: cf *℞*
159 *ἐμπλήσω*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτων* 376 Arm Pal Syh
159 *κυριεύσει*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^T) *αυτων* Phil I 188^{UF} Arm Pal^α Syh
1517 *εἰσαγαγών*] + (※ Syh) *αυτους* 376 Pal^β Syh (*α' Syh^{LText}*)
1519 *ἄρμασιν*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* 376 Bo Fa Syh (*οἱ γ' (ὁ ἐβρ' L) Syh^{Text}*)
1519 *ἀναβάταις*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* (-*τους* 46) A M 29-376 14-52'-54-78-131-313'-
422-500'-550' 129 85-321*-344-730 121 628 18 46 59 130 509 Arm Bo Pal^β Syh (*οἱ γ' (ὁ
ἐβρ' L) Syh^{Text}*)
1521 *ἀναβάτην*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* F^b 15-426 Aeth Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
162 *Ἀαρών*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *εν τη ερημω* 15-376' Arm Pal Syh (*σ' θ' Syh^{Text}*)
164 *τό*] pr (※ Syh) *ρημα* O 131^c Syh (*α' Syh^{Text}*)
164 *ἡμέραν*] + (※ Syh) *αυτης* O-72-15 Syh (*α' Syh^{Text}*)
167 *εἰσακοῦσαι*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτον* 15-72-426 Arm Sa Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1610 *καὶ 2°*] sub ※ Syh(mend); + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *ιδου* F^b O-58-15 318 128'-628 Arm Pal Syh
(*οἱ γ' (ὁ ἐβρ' L) Syh^{Text}*)
1613 *ἐσπέρα*] pr (※ Syh) *εν* 426 Arm Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1616 *καθήκοντας*] + (※ Syh) *παρ αυτω* O-58-15 128'-628 Arm Syh
1625 *φάγετε*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτο* (*αυτω* 376) O-58-15 318 Arm Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1625 *οὐχ*] pr (※ Syh) *σημερον* 376 Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1625 *εὑρεθήσεται*] + (※ Syh) *αυτο* O-58-15 318 Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{LText}*)
1634 *καὶ ἀπέθετο*] sub ※ Syh^T(mend); + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτο* O-58-15 19' Arm Co Pal Syh
173 *ἡμᾶς 2°*] sub ※ Syh(mend) (*σ' Syh^{Text}*)
175 *ῥάβδον*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *σου* O-58-15 Aeth Arab Arm Pal Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
177 *πειράζειν*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτους* O-72-15 Arm Co Syh
178 *Ἰσραήλ*] pr (※ Syh) *προς* 15-426 Syh (*σ' Syh^{LText}*)
1711 *χεῖρας 1°*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* (*εαυτ.* 426^c) O-58-15-707 527 ^{Lat}Ruf *Ios* I 2 Aeth
Arab Arm Co Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1711 *χεῖρας 2°*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* 15-376'-707 527 ^{Lat}Ruf *Ios* I 2 *Num* XIX 1 Aeth
Arab Arm Co Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1716 *ᾗτι*] pr (※ Syh) *και ειπεν* 15-376' 128-628 ^{Lat}Ruf *Num* XIX 1 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (*οἱ γ'
Syh^{Text}*)
1716 *κρυφαία*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *ᾧ* O-15 ^{Lat}codd 91 95 96 Arm Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
181 *Ἰσραήλ 1°*] pr (※ Syh) *τω* (> 58') *μωυση* (c var) *και* O-15 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
185 *οἱ*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* F 15-376' 131^(c) 19' 44' *n t* Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh (*οἱ γ'
Syh^{LText}*)
187 *ἀλλήλους*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *εις ειρηνην* 376' 128-628 Arm Syh (*α' Syh^{Text}*); + *εν ειρηνη*
15
188 *γαμβρῶ*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* F^b O-58-15 126 19' 44 53' 730 84 527 128-628 59 799
Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1810 *fin*] + (※ Arm^{ms}; + ※ *θ' is* ≠ Syh) *ος* (*ως* 376; *quia* Arm) *εξελατο τον λαον υποκατωθεν*
χειρος αιγυπτιων 376' Arm Syh
1814 *τί 1°*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *το ρημα* F^b O-58-15 131^c 318 128'-628 Arm Syh (*α' 57'
130-321-344 Syh^{Text}*)
1815 *γαμβρῶ*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* F^{avid} O-58-15 19' 53' 30 84 527 59 799 Cyr *Ad* 280^V
^{Lat}cod 104 Aug *Ex* 67^{ap} Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh (*οἱ γ' Syh^{Text}*)
1824 *γαμβροῦ*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* F^{b1} 15-376' 77 19' 53' 458 30' 318 628-630 Cyr *Ad*
281^{RV} ^{Lat}PsAmbr *Mans* 11 Ruf *Ex* XI 6 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh

- 1824 *ῥσα*] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *παντα* 15-72-426 19' 121 68' Arm Bo Syh
 192 *Σινά*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *και παρενεβαλον εν τη ερημω* 426 Arm Syh
 1910 *ἰμάτια*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτων* F^b O-58-15 *b* 44 53' 75 318 128'-628 799 Bas II 453 Or
Sel 293 ^{Lat}Aug *Ep* LV 30 *Ex* 70^{ap} Cyp *Quir* II 25 EvagrGall II 4 MissMoz 414 Ruf *Ex*
 XI 7 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt}); + *εαυτων* F 29 Cyr VI 688
 1914 *ἰμάτια*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτων* F^b 15-72-376-707 C'' *b* 527 59 ^{Lat}Spec 48 Aeth Arab
 Arm Bo Pal Syh; + *εαυτων* 426 318
 1916 *φωνή*] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^T) *και* F O-15 ^{Lat}Spec 54 Aeth^C Arm Pal Syh
 1918 *ό καπνός*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* F^b O-58-15 Arm^{te} Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 205 *γενεᾶς*] sub ※ Syh(mend) (σ' Syh^{txt})
 2010 *προσήλυτος*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *σου* O-58-15 Arm^{te} Syh^L (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2018 *λαός* 2°] + (※ Syh) *και σαλευθεις* O-72-15 Arm Syh (α' Syh^{txt})
 2019 *καί* 2°] pr (※ Syh) *και ακουσομεθα* (sub ※ Arm^{mss}) O-15 131^{c2} CyrHier 740 Arm Syh
 2024 *όλοκαυτώματα*] + (※ Syh) *υμων* B O-15-707 458 121' 68' 424 Cyr *Ad* 592^E Arm Sa Syh:
 𐤓𐤊 hab 𐤒𐤒𐤋𐤃
 2024 *πρόβατα*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *υμων* O-58-15 Arm Co Syh: 𐤓𐤊 hab 𐤒𐤒𐤋𐤃
 2025 *εγχειρίδιον* F oI C''-126 131^c 129 x 120' 76' Tht *Ex* 132^{ap} Aeth^{EH} Sa] *εγχειριον* 59; + (※
 Arm Syh) *σου* (μου A) rell = 𐤓𐤊
 214 *κύριος*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^T) *αυτου* O-58-15 19' 458 18 46 Aeth-^R Arm Bo^A Sa Syh (ό έβρ'
 Syh^{txt})
 215 *γυναῖκα* A B 58 *b* 125 129 z 59 426 ^{Lat}Ambr *Ep* VII 14] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *μου* rell (ό έβρ'
 Syh^{txt})
 215 *παιδιά*] + (※ Syh) *μου* F O-58-15-707 C'' *d* 75 *t* x 318-527 59 76' 424 509 646 Phil
 I 157 verss
 216 *οὗς*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* O-15 *d n t* ^{Lat}codd 91 94 95 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 218 *εὐαρεστίῃ*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *εν οφθαλμοις* F^a O-72-15 318-527 424 Arm Syh (ό έβρ'
 Syh^Ltxt)
 218 *αὐτῆς*] + 𐤀 Syh^L(mend)
 219 *νῖφ*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* O'-58-15 *f*-56* *s*-30' 318-527 55 76' 424 Aeth Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ'
 Syh^{txt})
 2110 *δέοντα*] + (※ Syh) *αυτης* O-72-15 108^c 318 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2110 *ἰματισμόν*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτης* 15-376 318 Arm Bo Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2114 *πλησίον*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O-58-15 628 76 Eus VIII 2.254 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Co Syh
 (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2117 *ἀποδῶται*] sub ※ Syh^T(mend); + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^L) *αυτον* 15-376 318 Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ'
 Syh^Ltxt)
 2118 *πλησίον*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O-58-15 Eus VIII 2.254 ^{Lat}cod 100 Spec 58 Arm Co
 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2119 *ῥάβδου*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* F^b O-58-15 *f*-56* Eus VIII 2.255 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2122 *ἐπιβάλῃ*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^L) *αυτω* 15-376 Arm Co Syh
 2122 *δώσει* — fin B 82' 129 n Phil III 100^{te} ^{Lat}codd 91 94 95 100 Luc *Athan* II 5 Spec 58 Sa]
 > 25 628; pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *και* rell (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2126 *ἐκτυφλώσῃ*] + (※ Syh) *αυτην* 376 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2130 *ῥσα*] pr (※ Arm^{ms} Syh; + *και* 72) *κατα παντα* O-58-15 C''-126 646 Arm Syh (α' θ' (σ' τ)
 Syh^{txt})
 2133 *λατομήσῃ*] + (※ Syh) *τις* 15-376 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 2135 *πλησίον*] + (※ Syh^L) *αυτου* O-58-15 C'' *n*-127 318 646 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Bo Syh
 2136 *αὐτόν*] + (※ Syh) *ο κυριος αυτου* (> Arm) O-58-15 318 Arm^{ap} Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 223 *κλέμματος*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* F^a O-58-15 *f*-56* Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 224 *ὄνου*] pr (※ Syh) *μοσχου και* O-72-15 128'-628 426 Eus VIII 2.131 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 226 *ἀποτείσει*] pr (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αποτιννων* 15-72-376 318 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 227 *πλησίον*] + (※ Syh) *αυτου* 15'-58-376 46 76' 799 ^{Lat}PsAmbr *Lex* 10 Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ'
 Syh^{txt})
 228 *πλησίον*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* 15-72-376 Arm Sa Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 229 *πλησίον*] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* 15-72-376 *f*-56* ^{Lat}cod 103 Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2210 *πλησίον*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^T) *αυτου* O-767-15 53' 318 ^{Lat}cod 103 Aeth Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ'
 Syh^{txt})

- 2211 *πλησίον*] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* 15-72-376 19 Lat^{cod} 103 Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2212 *κλαπῆ*] pr (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *κλοπη* O⁽⁻³⁷⁶⁾-15 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 2212 *κυρίῳ*] + (* Syh) *αυτου* F^b 72-767^{c-οII-707} C'' d f-129 n⁻¹²⁷ 85^{mg}-130^{mg} t x 318' z 59
 426 509 646' Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2213 *αὐτόν*] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *μαρτυρα* (cvar) 15-72-376 131^c 128'-628 426 Arm Syh:
 cf $\mathfrak{M}$
 2214 *πλησίον*] + (* Syh) *αυτου* 15-72-376 739 Lat^{cod} 103 Arab Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2214 *κύριος*] + (* Syh) *αυτου* 15-72-376 f^{-56*} n⁻¹²⁷ 628 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
 2214 *ἀποτεῖσει*] pr (* Syh^L) *αποτιννων* (-τυνν. 246) 15-72-376 f^{-56^{txt}} 128'-628 426 Arm Syh
 (θ' Syh^{L^{txt}}); pr *αποτισιν* F^b
 2215 *κύριος*] + (* Syh) *αυτου* 15-58 C''^(-16 131) f^{-56*} n⁻¹²⁷ γ⁻³⁹² 128'-628 76' 424 426 646
 Arab Arm Sa Syh^L (θ' Syh^{L^{txt}})
 2225 *ἀδελφῶ*] + (* Arm^{ms}) *σου* F^a O-15 75 x Cyr *Ad* 564^{PR} Arm Sa Syh: $\mathfrak{M}$ hab מֵי
 2226 *ἀποδώσεις*] + (* Syh) *αυτο* 15-72-376 f⁻²⁴⁶ 128'-628 426 Co Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 2227 *ἰμάτιον*] + (* Syh) *αυτου* 15-376 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2227 *εἰσακούσομαι*] pr (* Syh) *και* 15-58-376 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
 2230 *μητέρα*] + (* Syh) *αυτου* A 15-72-376 318 76' Aeth Arm Co Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2231 *θηρίαλωτον*] pr (* Syh) *εν τω* (> f) *αγρω* 15-58-376 f^{-56*} 318 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ (σ' θ' Syh^{txt});
 + (*^{ms}) *in agro* Arm
 236 *πένητος*] + (* Syh) *σου* 72-376 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 237 *ἀδφον*] pr (* Syh) *και* O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 53' Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
 2310 *init*] pr (* Arm Syh) *και* 15-72-376 Arm^{ms} Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2311 *ὑπολειπόμενα*] + (* Syh; + * Arm^{ms}) *αυτων* 15-72-376 f^{-56*} γ⁻³⁹² Arm Syh (α' σ'
 Syh^{txt})
 2318 *comma*] sub * 57'-73-422-500' 730* | *init* — *σου* 2°] pr * 85; sub * 343'-730^c(vid);
 > F 72 n x 527 128 55 426 Lat^{cod} 102 Aeth Arab Arm Syh
 All the * in this verse are errors for the obelus.
 2321 *οὐ*] pr * 730(mend)
 2322 *init* F 29-οI^{-64^{mg}} x γ⁻³⁹² 68' 59 76' 424 Lat^{cod} 102 Aeth Arab Arm] pr (cvar; * 64^{mg} 57'-
 73-500' 56 130) *εαν ακοη ακουσητε της εμης φωνης και ποιησης παντα οσα αν εντειλωμαι σοι*
και φυλαξητε την διαθηκην μου εσεσθε μοι λαος περιουσιος απο παντων των εθνων εμη γαρ
*εστιν πασα η γη υμεις δε εσεσθε μοι βασιλειον ιερατευμα και εθνος αγιον (εαν — αγιον sub * 85-344;*
*εσεσθε 1° — αγιον sub * Syh) ταυτα τα ρηματα ερεις τοις υιοις ιηλ* rel: contra $\mathfrak{M}$
 This was probably a preOrigenian gloss from 19s—6 which Origen then placed sub
 obelo, i.e. all the asterisks are errors for obelus.
 2324 *καθελεῖς*] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτους* 15-72-376 C'' f^{-56*} 318 128'-628 426 646 Aeth Arm
 Co Syh
 2327 *φῶβον*] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *μου* F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15 C''⁻⁵⁵¹ f^{-56*} 318 424 646 Arab Arm Bo^B Syh
 (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 2329 *αὐτούς*] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *απο προσωπου σου* O⁻⁵⁸-15 C'' f^{-56^{txt}} 318 646 Arab Arm Syh
 (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
 243 *τά 2°*] pr (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *παντα* 15-376-767 318 Arab Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{T^{txt}})
 2412 *τὸν νόμον*] pr (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *και* 15-58 628 Cyr *Gl* 524 Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{T^{txt}})
 253 *χαλκόν*] pr (* Syh) *και* B 15-72-376 Lat^{cod} 102 Aeth^{MPR} Arab Arm Bo Syh (ό έβρ'
 Syh^{txt}); sub * Syh^T(mend)
 254 *ὑάκινθον*] pr (* Syh) *και* A B F M O^{'-64*} 767-15' 44-107' s t x 392 128'-407-628 18 46 55
 59 76' 426 509 646 Cyr *Ad* 593 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' τ) Syh^{txt}); sub *
 Syh^T(mend)
 254 *ποφύραν*] pr (* Syh) *και* A B 15-72-376 118'-537 s 59 Arm Bo Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' τ)
 Syh^{txt}); sub * Syh^T(mend)
 255 *καί 2°*] pr * Arm^{ms}(mend)
 255 *fin*] + (cvar; * Arm^{ms}) *και* (sub ÷ Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$; + * Syh^T) *ελαιον* (+ * Syh^T) *εις την*
φανσιν και θυμιαματα εις το ελαιον της χρυσεως και εις την συνθεσιν του θυμιαματος (και ult
*— fin sub * Syh) O⁻⁵⁸-15 131^{mg} 128'-628 426 646 Aeth^C Arm Syh*
 259 *μῆκος*] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτης* F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15 Hipp *Dan* XXIV 3 Aeth Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{L^{txt}})
 259 *πλάτος*] + (* Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτης* O⁻⁵⁸-15 C'' 424 Hipp *Dan* XXIV 3 Aeth Arm Syh (θ'
 Syh^{txt}); + *αυ^τ* F^b

- 259 ὕψος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης F^b 15-376-767 C'' 424 646 Hipp Dan XXIV 3 Aeth Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2511 κλίτη] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης 15-376 131^c 527 424 Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2511 κλίτος 1°] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-376 Syh
- 2511 κλίτος 2°] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15 Syh (σ' (α' τ) θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2514 fin] + (※Syh) ἐξ αὐτης 15-376-767 318 Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2516 μῆκος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτου F^b 15-376 318 ^{Lat}Ruf Rom III 8 SedScot Rom 3 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2516 πλάτος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτου F^b 15-376 16^c-500-739^c-cI⁷³ 413 761 318 424 ^{Lat}Ruf Rom III 8 SedScot Rom 3 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2516 fin] + ※ et cubitum et dimidium altitudinis eius ∟ Syh: contra 𐤎
- 2518 κλίτη] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτου F^b 15-376 C'' 646 ^{Lat}Ruf Rom III 3 SedScot Rom 3 Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2519 πτέρυγας] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτων 15-72-376 458 Arm Bo Syh: contra 𐤎 (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2522 χρυσίου καθαροῦ] (※Syh) ἐκ ξύλων ἀσηπτῶν F^b 15-72-376 131^c 127 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh^{Ltxt} (θ' Syh^{txt})
- This reading does not conform to Origen's stated principles according to which he would have placed the lemma sub obelo and then added the reading of θ'.
- 2522 μῆκος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης O⁻⁵⁸-15 318 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt}); + αὐ^τ F^b
- 2522 εὐρος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης 15-376 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2522 ὕψος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης O⁻⁵⁸-15 C'' 318 646 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2523 init] pr (cvar) καὶ καταχρυσώσεις αὐτην (sub ※Arm^{ms}) χρυσιῳ καθαρῳ (sub ※Syh^L) F^b O-15-707 131^{mg} 19' 127 γ⁻³⁹² Aeth^C Arm Syh
- 2524 κυμάτιον] + (※Syh) χρυσουν A 15-376 131^c Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2524 στεφάνη] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-376 131^c Syh (α' σ' Syh^{txt})
- 2525 ποιήσεις] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτη F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15 C'' f-56* s 318 126 646 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 102 Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2525 τῶν] (※Syh) α εστιν των τεσσαρων (+ των 318) 15-72-376 318 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2528 αὐτης] sub ※Syh(mend) (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 2528 θύσκας] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης 15-72-376 Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 2528 σπονδεῖα] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-376 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2528 κνάθους] + (※Syh) αὐτης (-τοις 376) 15-58-376 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2530 καλαμίσκοι] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-72-376 Aeth Bo^A Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{txt})
- 2530 κρατήρες] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-72-376 Aeth Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' τ) Syh^{txt})
- 2530 σφαιρωτήρες] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-376 Aeth Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 2530 κρίνα] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-72-376 ^{Lat}codd Al: 91 94—96 Aeth Syh^L (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 2531 πλαγίων] + (※Syh^L) αὐτης F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15 ^{Lat}codd Al: 91 94—96 Arm Bo Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2531 κλίτους 2°] + (※Syh) αὐτης 15-72 46 Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 2532 κρίνον] + (c var; ※Arm^{ms} Syh) καὶ τρεῖς κρατήρες ἐκτετυπωμενοι καρυσκουs εν τω ενι καλαμισκω σφαιρωτηρ και κρινον Compl Arm Syh
- 2533 σφαιρωτήρες] + (※Syh) αὐτης F^b 15-72-376 Syh
- 2534 καί — αὐτῆς 2°] sub ※Arm^{ms}(mend); ἐξ αὐτῆς sub ※Syh^L(mend); + (※Syh^T) καὶ σφαιρωτηρ υπο τους δυο καλαμισκουs ἐξ αὐτης F^b Syh
- 2536 σφαιρωτήρες] + (※Syh) αὐτων 15-72-376 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2536 καλαμίσκοι] + (※Syh) αὐτων 15-72-376 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2537 προσώπου] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης F^b O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15-707 131^c 19' 527 Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 2538 ποιήσεις] + (※Arm^{ms}) αὐτην 15-376 ^{Lat}codd Al: 91 96 Arm^{te} Syh
- 2539 τάλαντον — fin] sub ※85(mend)
- 265 ἀντιπίπτουσαι] + (+ erunt eae Syh; ※Syh) αι (>426) αγκυλαι 15-72-376 131^c 128'-628 426 Syh
- 265 ἐκάστην] + (※^{ms}) ansae Arm: contra 𐤎
- 2613 τῶν 1° — μήκουs] ※ in longitudine ∟ Syh (σ' Syh^{Ttxt}); >A F 58 118'-537 392 59 Aeth Bo^AB: homoiot

Given the shorter text of Syh its text with the hex plus = 𐤎. But with the longer text of Exod the plus would create a doublet. Origen must have had the shorter text before him for the hex reading in Syh to make sense.

- 2613 ἔσται] pr (※ Syh) και 15-72-376-οΙ 19' 76' ^{Lat}codd 91 95 96 Ruf Cant 2 Arm Syh: contra
 2613 καλύπτει] + (※ Syh) αυτην 15-72-376 131^c 128-628 426 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2615 ἀσήπτων] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) εστωτας 15-72-376 318 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2616 πήχεων] + (※ Syh) μηκος 72 Arm Syh
- 2616 ἡμίους] + ※ cubiti ↯ Syh = 2R; + (※^{mss}) crassitudinem Arm
- 2620 κλίτος] + (※ Syh) της σκηνης O-767-15 Syh
- 2624 κεφαλῶν] + (※^{mss}) eius Arm^{Ltxt} = 2R; + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) αυτων 15-72-376 Arm^{mss} Syh = Tar^O
- 2625 δέκα ἔξ] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) βασεις F^b 376 Arm Syh
- 2629 δακτυλίου] + (※ Syh) αυτων F^b 15-72-376 Sa Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2636 ἐπίσπαστρον] + (c var; ※ Syh; + ※ Arm^{mss}) τη θυρα της σκηνης B^{ms} O-58-15 γ-392 128'-628 426 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 Arab Arm Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2637 στίλους] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) ασηπτους F^b 15-72-376-707 131^c 527 128'-628 426 Aeth^C Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 271 θυσιαστήριον 1°] pr (※ Syh) το F^b 15-58-376 Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{Ltxt}); sub ※ Syh^T(mend)
- 272 κέρατα 1°] + (※ Syh) αυτου O-58-15 318 Arm Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 272 γωνιών] + (※ Syh) αυτου O-15 527 Arm Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 272 κέρατα 2°] + (※ Syh) αυτου O-58-15 318 Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 274 κλίτη] + αυ^r F^b; + (※ Syh) αυτου 15-72-376 Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 277 φορεῖς 1°] αναφορεῖς αυ^r F^b; + (※ Syh) αυτου 15-72-376 Syh
- 2713 τό] pr (※ Syh^L) το πρωτον 15-376-767^(ms) Arm Syh: 2R hab פתח
- 281 αὐτοῦ] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) μετ αυτου O-58 318 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 281 μοι] + ※ eum ↯ Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 283 ἱερατεύσει] + (※ Syh) αυτος 72-376 Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 284 Ἀαρών] + (※ Arm^{mss}) τω αδελφω σου 805(vid) 72-376 Arab Arm Syh (ο' α' σ' θ' 344)
- 284 ἱερατεύειν] + (※ Syh) αυτον 72-376 318 Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 285 κόκκινον] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) κεκλωσμενον (c var) O-767 131^c Arm Syh (ο' 344)
- 286 ἐπωμίδα] + (c var; ※ Arm^{mss}) εκ (sub ※ Syh = σ' Syh^{Ltxt}) χρυσιου και νακινθου (+ ※ Syh^T) και πορφυρας και κοκκινου νενησμενου F^b O 318 128'-628 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' pro ο' 73-550 85-344)
- 287 μέρεσιν] + (※ Syh) αυτου 72-376 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 288 ποιήσιν] + (※ 344) αυτων O-58 344^{ms} Syh: 2R hab מנענע
- 2810 ὀνόματα 1°] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^L) αυτων 72-767 318 Arm Pal Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2810 τά 1°] sub ※ Syh(mend): cf α' τά Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2811 fin] + (c var) περικεκυκλωμενους και συνεσφραγισμενους χρυσιω ποιησεις αυτους (sub ※ Syh^L) O-58 131^{ms} 121^{ms}-318 128'-628 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 Arab Arm Syh (σ' 344)
- 2816 μῆκος] + (※ Syh) αυτου B^c 72-376 Syh (α' σ' θ' 344; α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt}); + αυ^r F^b
- 2816 εὖρος] + (※ Syh) αυτου 376 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt}); + αυ^r F^b
- 2821 ὄνομα] + (※ Syh) αυτου 376-767 Arm Bo Syh (α' σ' θ' ο' 344; ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2823 init — (25) fin] sub ※ Syh^T(mend)
- 2823 στήθους] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh) αυτου O 131^c Arm Bo Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2823 εἰσιόντι] + (※ Arm^{mss}) αυτω O-58 131^c Arm (ο' 344)
- 2823 θεοῦ] + (※ Arm^{mss}) δια (δι 72) παντος F^b O C'' 246 318 126-128'-628 646 Aeth^C Arm Syh
- 2825 fin] + (※ Syh^L) δια παντος 128'-630 Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{Ltxt}): mend pro 2823 (4°) supra
- 2826 στήθους 2°] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^L) αυτου O-58 131^c Cyr Ad 744 Arab Arm Bo Syh (α' σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2828 ἐξ αὐτοῦ 1°] (※ Syh) της αρχης αυτου O-58 Syh (ο' σ' 344)
- 2828 μέσον] + (※ Syh) αυτου O-58 131^c Syh (ο' 130-321-344; οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2828 περιστομίον] + (※ Syh^L) αυτου 376 Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2831 Ἀαρών] pr (※ Syh^L) επι O-72 318 Arm Syh (ο' θ' 57'-73 85-130; θ' ο' 344; οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2831 εἰσιόντι] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^L) αυτω O-58 Arm Syh
- 2831 ἐξιόντι] + (※ Arm^{mss} Syh^L) αυτω O-58 Arm Syh
- 2838 ἔως] pr ※ et ↯ Syh (α' σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 292 ἀζύμους] + (※ Syh^L) και κολλυρας αζυμους O-58 131^c Arm Syh (ο' 344; οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 295 ἐνδύσεις] + (※ Syh^L) eas Syh: contra 2R (σ' Syh^{Ltxt})

- 295 ποδήρη] + (※^{ms}) *super subuculas* Arm; + (※Syh^L) του επενδυματος C" 318 646 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$; + και τον υποδυτην (c var) της επωμιδος (επομ. 376) O-72 128'-628
- 299 ζώναις] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh^L; + ※Syh^T) ααρων και τους υιους αυτου O-58 Arm Syh (ο' α' σ' θ' + Ααρων 57'-78 85'-130-344)
- 2914 δέρμα] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτου F^b O-58 C" 318 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' l) Syh^{txt})
- 2914 κόπρον] + (※Syh) αυτου O-58 C" 318 646 Aeth Arab Bo Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 2914 πυρί] pr (※Syh) εν O-72 b-19 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2916 αίμα] + (※Syh) αυτου O C" 318 319 Aeth Arab Arm Syh (ο' θ' σ' α' 344; ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2917 μέλη] + (※Syh) αυτου O Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2917 ένδόσθια] + (※Syh) αυτου O-58 C" 318 Arab Bo Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2917 πόδας] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτου O-58 52'-761 318 Arab Arm Bo Syh; + αυ^τ F^b
- 2917 διχοτομήματα] + (※Syh) αυτου O-58-15 318 Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' l) Syh^{txt})
- 2917 κεφαλή] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτου O-58-15 C" 318 646 Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2918 όλοκαύτωμα] + (※Arm Syh^T) εστι O-58 318 Aeth^C Arm^{ms} Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2920 Άαρων] + (c var; ※Syh; + του δεξιου 376 Arm) και επι τον λοβον του ωτος των (om τ. ω. τ. F^b) υιων αυτου F^b O-58 Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2920 χειρός] + (※Syh) αυτων O-58 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt}); + (※Arm^{ms}) αυτου F^a n t 318 509 Aeth Arm
- 2920 ποδός] + (※Syh^L) αυτων O-58 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$; + αυτου F^a 58 246 n t Aeth Arm
- 2920 fin] + (※344 Arm^{ms} Syh^L) και προσχεις (c var) το αιμα επι το θυσιαστηριον κυκλω O 85'^{ms}-130^{ms}-343-344^{ms} 318 128'-628 Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2922 τό στέαρ] sub ※344^{ms}(mend); + (+ αυτου 376 128'-628 Arab; ※344 Arm^{ms} Syh^L) και την κερκον O-58 131^c 85'^{ms}-130^{ms}-343-344^{ms} 318 128'-628 Arab Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2923 ένα] + (c var; ※Syh^L) και κολλυραν αρτου O 131^c Arab(vid) Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2923 έλαιου] + (※Syh^L) μιαν O 131^c Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2928 σωτηρίων] + (※Syh) αυτων M^{ms} O-58 d n t 392 Lat^{codd} 91 94—96 Aeth Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 2928 άφαίρεμα 3°] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh^L) αυτων O(-58) Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2928 κυρίω] pr (※Syh^L) τω O'(-58)-15 126-128'-628 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2929 τελειώσαι] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh^L) εν αυτοις 72 Arm Syh
- 2931 κρέα] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh^L) αυτου 72 Aeth Arab Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
- 2941 ποιήσεις 2°] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτω 376 Arm Syh (α' σ' Syh^{txt})
- 2942 σοι 2°] + (※Syh) εκει F^a 376 128'-628 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt})
- 2943 καί 2°] pr (※85-344-730) και αγιασθησονται εν τοις υιοις τη^λ C"-16 52 n-75 s t 628-630: contra $\mathfrak{M}$
- 2946 θεός 2°] pr $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ (sub ※Arm^{ms} Syh) ο (> 376) O-72 Arab Arm Syh: cf $\mathfrak{M}$
- 301 θυσιαστήριον] + (※344 Arm^{ms} Syh; + ※85) θυματηριον (c var) M^{ms} 376 131^c 127 85-343' Lat^{cod} 100 Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 302 μήκος] + (※Syh) αυτου O-58 Aeth Arab Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 302 εύρος] + (※Syh) αυτου O-58 Aeth Arab Syh (α' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 304 κλίτη] + (※Syh) αυτου 376 Aeth Syh
- 304 πλευροίς] + (※Syh) αυτου O Aeth Arm Bo Syh
- 306 της — μαρτυρίων] sub ※344^{ms}(mend); + (c var; ※344 Syh; + και 458) κατα προσωπον του ιαστηριου ο εστιν επι των μαρτυριων M^{ms} O-58 131^{ms} d 246 n-75 344^{ms} t 318 128'-628 18 55 Meth 158 Arab Arm Syh
- 3012 κυρίω] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) εν τη επισκοπη αυτων (-του 376 318) O-58-707-707^I 318 Lat^{codd} 91 94—96 Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
- 3019 πόδας] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτων O-767°-707^I C"-413 19 d 53' n t 527 318 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{txt}); + αυ^τ F^b
- 3021 χείρας] + (※Syh) αυτων F^b 58-376 C" 318 Aeth Bo Syh (α' σ' Syh^{txt})
- 3021 πόδας] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτων F^b 58-376 C"-73 b 646 Aeth Arm Bo Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
- 3023 λάβε] sub ※344^{ms}(mend); + (※344 Syh) σεαυτω (σαυτω 58) O-707^I 246 85-130-321'-344^{ms} 318 126-128'-628 Lat^{codd} 91 94—96 Ruf Cant 1 Arm Bo Syh (σ' Syh^{txt})
- 3027 init] pr (※Arm^{ms}) και την τραπέζαν (x. τ. pr. sub ※Syh = οί γ' Syh^{txt}) και παντα τα σκευη αυτης F^b O-58-707^I 131^{ms} n Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh

- 30₃₄ δυνῶα] pr (※Syh^L) και M O-767-29-707^I C''(-761) d f-129 s t 392 z 18 46 424 509 646' Cyr Ad 648 Arab Arm Bo Syh
30₃₆ θήσεις] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) ες αυτου 376 246 318 126-128'-628 Arm Syh (ο έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
30₃₇ init] pr (※Syh) και (>53') το 72-376-707^I 53' 318 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
30₃₇ θυμίαμα] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) ο ποιησεις (facietis Arm) 72-376-707^I 318 Arm Syh (α' σ' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
30₃₈ ὄς] pr (※Arm^{mss}Syh) ανηρ (+ ωσαντως 72-707^I Arab) Fb² 72-376-707^I 85^{mgs}-130^{mgs}-321'^{mgs} Arab Arm Syh (α' σ' 344 Syh^{Ltxt})
31₃ έν] pr (※Syh^L) και 376 C'' 30'-85-343' 646 Cyr Ad 649^P Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
31₅ λιθουργικά] + (※Syh) πληρωσεως 376 Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
31₆ ἐγώ] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) ecce Arm Syh (α' σ' θ' 344; α' σ' 130-321'; α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
31₇ καί 3°] sub ※Syh^L(mend); + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) συμπασαν O-58-707^I 318 128'-628 Arab Arm Syh
31₈ fin] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) και το θυσιαστηριον του θυμιαματος και το θυσιαστηριον της ολοκαυτωσεως (pro τ.ολ.: του ολοκαυτωματος Fb²; holocaustorum Arm Syh) και παντα τα σκευη αυτου Fb² O-58-707^I 318 Arab Arm Syh (α' σ' θ' 130-321'-344; θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
31₁₀ λειτουργικάς] + (※Syh^L) και τα ματια του αγιου 72-376-707^I 131^{mgs} 318 Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
31₁₀ Ἀαρών] + (※Syh^L) τω ιερει 376 Syh = 𐤀𐤏 (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt}); + (※Arm^{mss}) του ιερεως 72-707^I Arab Arm
31₁₅ θανατωθήσεται (c var) B 55^{Ltxt}] pr (※Arm^{mss}) θανατω (c var) rell
31₁₈ κατέπανσεν] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) αυτος 376 318 Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₂ ὑμῶν] + (※Syh^L; + ※Arm^{mss}) και (+ των Fb 767) υιον υμων (>58 Arm) Fb O 131^c 318 Latcod 100 Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₂ θυγατέρων] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) υμων 376 131^c-413 Arab Arm Co Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₈ μόσχον] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) χωνευτον O-58 131^c 318 Arab Arm Syh (σ' θ' 344; οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₈ και τεθύκασιν αὐτῷ] sub ※M(mend)
32₉ Αἰγύπτου] + (c var; ※Arm^{mss}Syh) και ειπεν 𐤁𐤍 προς μωσην εωρακα τον λαον τουτον και ιδου λαος σκληροτραχηλος εστιν O-58-29' 131^{mgs} 106^{mgs} 128'-628 46 Ach Arab Arm Syh (σ' θ' 85-130-344)
32₁₀ ὀργῇ] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) μου 72-376 131^c Aeth Arm Syh (α' σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₁₁ ὀργῇ] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) σου O-767-618 131^c Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₁₂ ἀποκτείναι] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) αυτους 376-767 C''-131-422 d 56' n t 318 426 646' verss
32₂₂ ὀργίζου] + (※Syh) θυμω O-58 131^c 246 318 126-128'-628 Arm Syh
32₂₂ κύριε] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) μου (εμου 246) O-58 246 318 126-128'-628 Aeth-C Arab Arm Bo Syh
32₂₄ ἔρηψα] + (※Syh^L) αυτα O-58 527 426 Co Syh (α' σ' θ' Syh^L); + (※Arm^{mss}) illud Latcodd 100 103 Arm
32₂₇ μηρόν] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) αυτου 72-376 422 18 426 Bas III 368 Latcod 100 Ambr Ep LXVI 7 Luc Parc 1 Arm Co Syh (σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₂₉ νιφ] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) αυτου O-58 246 527 z 426 Bas III 318 Arm Co Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₂₉ ἀδελφῷ] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) αυτου 72-376 527 318 426 Bas III 368 Arab Arm Co Syh (οί γ' (ό έβρ' L) Syh^{Ltxt}); + αυ^r Fb
32₂₉ ἐρ' ὑμᾶς] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) σημερον 72-376 318 Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
32₃₂ ἁμαρτίαν] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh) αυτων B M' 376-767-oII-29 C''-25 52 413 422 44-125' 129 n 30'-130-321'-344 r-84^{Ltxt} 527 318 55 426 509 646 Did Eccl 351.10 Hiob 182.3 Latcodd 100 103 Aug Ex 147 Arab Arm Co Syh
33₄ fin] + (c var; ※M 344 Arm^{mss}Syh^L-vid) και ουκ εθηκεν ανηρ κοσμον αυτου επ αυτου Fa M'^{mgs} O 131^{mgs} d n 344^{mgs} t 18 55* Arab Arm Syh
33₅ init — 'Ισραήλ] sub ※344^{mgs}(mend; cf infra)
33₅ κύριος] + (※Syh^L) προς μωσην (c var) Fb O-707 131^c d 246 n 344^{mgs} t 527 121^{mgs}-318 z 18 LatLuc Conven 1 Arab Arm Syh
33₅ κόσμον] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) σου (μου 318) απο σου O 131^c 318 Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
33₇ ἐκλήθη] + (※Arm^{mss}Syh^L) αυτη O-58 318 Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
33₇ σκηνήν 2°] + (※Syh^L; + την 107 74') του μαρτυριου O-58-707 d n t 527 318 Latcod 100 Luc Conven 1 Arab Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})

- 337 *ἐξω* 2°] pr (※ Syh^L) *την* B O²⁹ 73'-550' *b d n t* 527 426 Sa Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 339 *Μωνση*] pr (※ Syh^L) *τω* 126-128' Eus VI 237 Syh (σ' Syh^{Ltxt}); pr *μετα* 376 Arm = **ℳ**
 3311 *θεράπων*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* (*αυτω* F^{b2}) F^b O⁻⁵⁸ 131^c Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3314 *σου*] pr ※ Arm^{ms}(mend pro ÷); > 58 = **ℳ**
 3323 *χειρα*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *μου* Fa M' O^{-767*} -15' 16-25-57-77-131^c-500 *d f* 75*-127
 130-321' *t* 527 318 126 18 46 59 426 ^{Lat}Aug Ex CLIV 7(1°) Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 347 *καί* 7°] (※ Syh^L) *και επι* 551 ^{Lat}cod 100 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 The asterisk belongs before *επι*.
 349 *σου*] + (※ Syh) *ἔε* F^b 72-376 131^c 318 Arab Arm Syh
 349 *συμπορευθήτω*] + (※ Syh) *δη* 58-376 318 Syh
 3410 *σύ*] pr ※ Arm^{ms}(mend); + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *εν μεσω αυτου* (*eorum* Arm) O⁻⁵⁸ 318 Arm Syh
 3411 *σοι*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *σημερον* O⁻⁵⁸ Arab Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3412 *εισπορεύη*] pr (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *συ* O *b* Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3412 *μή* 767 *n* 426] + *σοι* B 15'; + *πως* 55 Bo; *ινα* *μη* 121; + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *ποτε* rell (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3414 *ονομα*] + (※ Syh^L) *αυτου* 72-376 126-128'-628 ^{Lat}cod 100 Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3419 *έμοι*] + (c var; ※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *και παντων των κτηνων σου* F^{b1} O 131^{mg*} Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3420 *ούκ*] pr (÷ Arm^{ms}(mend pro ※); + ※ Syh) *και* 72-376 318 Aeth Arm Syh
 3424 *ούκ*] pr (※ Syh) *και* 72-376 318 ^{Lat}codd 91 94 — 96 Aeth^R Arab Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3429 *πλάκες*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *της διαθηκης* O 318 Or IV 471 Arab Arm Syh
 3435 *δτι δεδόξασται*] sub ※ 344^{ms}(mend); + (c var; ※ 344) *η ουμς* (*η ο. sub* ※ Syh) *του χρωτος του προσωπου αυτου* O⁻⁵⁸ C" 85-130-321'-344^{ms} 318 Arab(vid) Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3435 *κάλυμμα*] (※ Syh) *το καλ.* (*καταλ.* 82) A F M 29-72-82-376-οΙ C" *d f*-¹²⁹ *s t x*-^{71*} *y* 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 646' (σ' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3435 *είσέλθῃ*] + (※ Syh) *αυτος* 376 Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 355 *καρδία*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτου* O 664 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Bo Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 355 *ἀργύριον*] pr (※ Syh^T) *και* O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth Arab Bo Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 356 *ύκινινθον*] pr (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *και* 72-376 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 356 *πορφύραν*] pr (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *και* O⁻⁵⁸ ^{Lat}Ruf Ex XIII 3 Aeth^P Arab Arm Bo Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3510 *παραρύματα*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *αυτης* O Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt}); + *αυ*^r F^b
 3510 *καλύματα*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *αυτης* (*αυ*^r F^b) F^b 376-767 Arm Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3510 *διατόνια*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *αυτης* (*αυ*^r F^b) F^b O⁻⁵⁸ Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3510 *μοχλούς*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth^C Arm Syh; + *αυ*^r F^b
 3510 *στύλους*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *αυτης* (*αυ*^r F^b) F^b O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth^{CRa} Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3511 *αυτης* 1°] sub ※ Arm^{ms}(mend)
 3512 *αυτης*] sub ※ Arm^{ms}(mend)
 3516 *init* — (17) *fin*] sub ※ Arm^{ms}(mend)
 3522 *πάντες*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *οι* (> 318) *ανδρες* 376 318 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3522 *κυριω*] (※ Syh) *τω κυριω* O⁽⁻⁷²⁾ 134 71' 319 426 Syh: **ℳ** hab *ליהויה* (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3523 *παρ'* *πας ανηρ* (sub ※ Arm^{ms} Syh) O⁽⁻⁷²⁾ Arm Syh (θ' α' σ' 85-130-344; α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3523 *καί* 2°] pr (+ ※ Syh) *και τριχες* (> O⁻⁵⁸ = **ℳ**; + *υ* Syh) *αιγαι* (*αιγες* 72; *αιγια* 376) O Aeth^C Arm Syh (σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3525 *χερσίν*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *αυτης* O⁻⁵⁸ 318 Aeth Arm Bo Syh (α' οί λ' inc 344)
 3529 *καί* 1°] sub ※ (mend pro ÷) Arm^{ms}: non hab **ℳ**
 3529 *εφερεν*] + (※ Syh^L) *eos* Syh = Sam: contra **ℳ**
 3529 *Μωνση*] pr (※ Arm^{ms}) *χειρος* 29 46 Arm
 3534 *διανοία*] + (※ Syh^L) *αυτου* O⁻⁵⁸ 318 Syh (ό έβρ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 361 *πάς*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *ανηρ* O⁻⁵⁸ 318 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 361 *έδόθη*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) *παρα* *ἔν* (θ^υ 318) O 131^c 318 Arm Syh
 361 *ποιεῖν*] pr (※ Syh) *ωστε* O⁻⁵⁸ 19' 246 *z*-¹²⁶ Syh: **ℳ** hab *נעשה*
 362 *σοφίαν*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *εν καρδια* 767 318 Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 362 *εν τη καρδίᾳ*] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αυτων* 72-376 318 Arm Syh^{Ltxt} = **ℳ**; ※ *eorum* *υ* Syh^T (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})

- 363 ἔργα] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh^L) της δουλ(ε)ιας O⁻⁵⁸ Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 364 τὰ ἔργα] pr (※Syh) παντα O⁽⁻⁷²⁾ 19' 318 319 Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
 365 Μουσῶν] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) λεγοντες A O⁻⁷² 121' Arm Syh (σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
 365 παρά] pr υπερ το ικανον της δουλ(ε)ιας (το — δουλ. sub ※ Syh^{Tvid}; της δουλ. sub ※ Syh^L)
 O⁻⁵⁸ 318 Arm Syh = **℞**
 365 ποιῆσαι] + (※Syh) αυτα O 131^c Bo Syh
 367 τήν] pr (※Arm^{ms}) πασαν O 318 Arm Syh (α' σ' θ' Syh^L)
 367 ποιῆσαι] + (※Arm^{ms}vid Syh^L) αυτα O-707 19' d n t 318 Arm Syh
 368 σοφός] + (※Syh^L) τη καρδια 72-767 121' 128-628 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3615 λόγιον] pr (※G; + ※ Syh^T) το A F^h O⁻⁷² 25 118'-537 71' 392 59 Bo Syh
 3616 τετράγωνον] + (※G Syh^L) ην G Arab Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3634 ῥοίσκος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) κωδων και ροισκος 376-767 Arm Syh
 3635 χιτώνας] pr (※Syh^L) τους 376-767 Arab Syh (σ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 3636 περισκελῆ] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) lintea (lintei Syh) Arm Syh = **℞** (θ' Syh^{txt}); + του εξαίρε-
 του O⁻⁷² (α' σ' Syh)
 3637 βόσσυ] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh^L) κεκλωσμενης O⁻⁵⁸ Arab Arm Syh (οί γ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 373 ὑφαντόν] + (※G; + και 58) εποιησεν αυτο (αυτη F^h; > 58) F^h O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3711 τό 2°] (※Syh) το πρωτον (c var) 376-767 Syh: **℞** hab **ⲙⲙⲣ**
 3714 αὐλῆς] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) κυκλω 376-767 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3721 καί 1°] (※Syh^L; + ※ Arm^{ms}) και μετα (+ τα 376) ταυτα O⁻⁵⁸ Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{Ltxt}); +
 μετ αυτου F^h 58 Aeth^C Arab = **℞** (α' σ' Syh^L)
 3721 ποικιλτά] + (※Syh^L) εν τη (> F^h) νακινθω F^h O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 399 καί 3° — fin] sub ※ Arm^{ms}(vid) Syh(mend); καί 3° — σκηνης sub ※ G(mend) | τούς 1°]
 pr παντας O⁽⁻⁷²⁾ Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = **℞** | τούς 2°] pr παντας O^{-G} Arab Arm Syh =
℞; παντους **✓** G
 Only the two plusses belong sub ast.
 3910 σκηνης] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) σκεπης 376-767 Arm Syh (α' σ' (θ' τ) Syh^{txt})
 3913 comma] sub ※ G Syh(mend) | κόκκινον] + το νενησμενον (c var) O Aeth^C Arab Arm
 Syh
 The asterisks at the beginning of the verse in G Syh probably are in error for το νενη-
 σμενον.
 3914 καί 3°] pr (※Arm^{ms} Syh) και την σκεπην O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (θ' Syh^{txt})
 402 του μηνός] sub ※ Syh^L(mend; α' θ' Syh^{Ltxt})
 402 νομηνία] νου※μηνια **✓** Syh^T(mend; α' θ' Syh^{Ttxt})
 402 σκηνήν] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) σκεπην (c var) O Arm Syh (α' σ' θ' Syh^{txt})
 406 του μαρτυρίου] pr (※Arm^{ms} Syh) σκεπης 767 Arm Syh = **℞** (α' σ' θ' Syh^{txt}); pr σκεπην
 72; + της σκεπης 376
 409 καί 2° — θυσιαστήριον 2°] pr ※ Arm^{ms}(mend); sub ※ Syh(mend; α' σ' θ' Syh^{txt}); >
 F*(cprm) 1000(vid) 19' d t 426 Cyr Ad 689: homoiot (**℞** hab)
 The tradition in Arm^{ms} Syh suggests that Origen's LXX was deficient and he therefore
 added καί 2° — θυσιαστήριον 2° from The Three.
 4010 Ἀαρών] pr (※G Syh) τον G-376 Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
 4011 Ἀαρών] pr (※G Syh) τον G-376 126 Syh (οί γ' Syh^{txt})
 4016 σκηνήν] + (※G Syh; + ※ Arm^{ms}) και εθηκεν τας βασεις αυτης O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 (σ' Syh^{Ttxt})
 4022 μαρτυρίου] + (※G Syh) απεναντι της τραπεζης O Arab Arm Syh (σ' (α' τ) Syh^{txt})

The above list contains 477 citations of which 37 are errors, leaving 440. Of these 418 asterisks are preserved by Syh (no distinction being made between Syh, Syh^L and Syh^T), 243 by Arm^{ms(s)}, 8 by 64, 8 by 344, 7 by G, and 1 by 85. (It should be noted that these signs are not always correctly placed.) To these should be added the attestations from *List 1* as well, i.e. 42 for Syh, 37 for Arm^{ms(s)}, 19 for G, and 2 for 344. The totals would then be 460 for Syh, 280 for Arm^{ms(s)}, 26 for G, 10 for 344, 14 for 64, and 1 for 85. The statistics for G are not meaningful, however, since it is only partially extant, viz. from 3635 to the end of the book.

As in the case of the first list, the signs are not only often misplaced but in some (11) cases the asterisk and the obelus are wrongly used. Nonetheless the hex tradition of plusses is very substantial.

Witnesses to the hex tradition are mainly the O mss (i.e. 58-72-376-426 (up to 201) and 767), as well as Arab Arm and Syh. Ms. 767 begins at 22₁ and lacks 28₂₃—30₁₆ and 40₁₉—₃₂ as well. For chh. 35—40 it is clearly hex, but prior to this its loyalties seem divided between O and *n*.

Of the 440 hex readings in *List 2*, and the 44 hex plusses in *List 1*, i.e. 484 citations, group support is as follows. O, here defined as at least 2 mss of the principal Greek O witnesses, support 406 hex plusses; in fact, only 21 citations have no support in O except for Arm and Syh; furthermore 58 hex plusses find support in one O ms. F^b including F^h witnesses to 81 plusses of which a number are similar to but not the exact equivalent of the hex plus concerned. Byzantine support (at least two of *d n t*) support 38 readings, and the groups individually: *n* five, *t* three and *d* only one. Other groups supporting the asterisked plusses are: C'' 52, *f* 30, *s* 28, *b* 23, *z* and *y* 19 each, and *x* 17. Popular hex readings, i.e. those enjoying the support of at least four text groups are 35.

Sources given for the readings in the two lists are difficult to tabulate since there is not always agreement when more than one witness attest to the source of a reading. In such cases I have tabulated the larger number in cases where one witness attributed a reading to more sources than another witness, i.e. if e.g. one witness attributed a reading to α' ϑ' and another only to ϑ' the reading has been tabulated as both α' and ϑ' . If two witnesses disagree on the source of a reading I have not tried to determine which witness is correct but counted both attributions.

The following tabulation is not without interest for noting Origen's preferences. For The Three ϑ' is given 145 times; α' 81 times and σ' 82. Attribution to $oi \gamma'$ occurs 87 times and 23 cases Syh^L and Syh^T disagree, one having $oi \gamma'$ and the other $\acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\beta\varrho'$. And other 62 readings are attributed solely to $\acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\beta\varrho'$. Others given are o' 10 times and $oi \lambda'$ once, but the reading is uncertain.

The frequent occurrence of $\acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\beta\varrho'$ as source is puzzling, since such a source for Origen is most unusual. All of these attributions occur in one or both of the Syh mss collated, and one suspects that everyone of these is the result of misreading $oi \gamma'$ as $\acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\beta\varrho'$ by a Syriac copyist. The Syriac for $oi \gamma'$ is a *gamma* written interlinearly, whereas $\acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\beta\varrho'$ is simply an '*ayin*' between the lines. In these contexts, they are extremely similar, the only difference being that the '*ayin*' should be written with the left side of the open angle lying in horizontal position, whereas for the *gamma* the angle tips obliquely. Since copyists probably had no idea what these letters signified they would tend to keep the *gamma* strictly interlinear, thereby making an '*ayin*' out of it. This is made even more likely when ms. 344 is examined alongside Syh. At 29₁₆ 344 attributes a hex plus to $o' \vartheta' \sigma' \alpha'$ and Syh to $\acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\beta\varrho'$. In other words 344 attributes a hex plus to all three sources i.e. $oi \gamma'$. It is reasonable then to conclude that the 64 $\acute{o} \acute{\epsilon}\beta\varrho'$ readings should be taken as readings of The Three; this would give a total of 172 $oi \gamma'$ readings.

C. This large amount of hex readings in the Exodus tradition can be amplified by citations where the asterisk is not present but has almost certainly been lost in the tradition. *List 3* is limited to such readings in which a plus variant equals $\mathfrak{M}$, is supported by at least one text group and/or at least one O witness. Again the fact that the variant = $\mathfrak{M}$ is taken for granted and has not been noted except where ambiguity might be possible.

List 3

- 12 *Ἰούδας*] pr και 426 Aeth Arab
 15 *ἐβδομήκοντα*] + *ψυχαι* 426 Arab Arm Syh
 25 *ἄβραν*] + *αυτης* 426 Ach Arab Sa³ Syh
 29 *μισθόν*] + *σου* 376' z Arm Co
 213 *πλησίον*] + *σου* 15-426 78 n⁻⁶²⁸ Latcod 100 Tert Marc IV 28 Arab Co Syh
 215 *ἐκάθισεν*] pr και 72-426 Latcod 100 Syh
 222 *ἔτεκεν υἱόν*] sub ✕ Syh(mend); pr και 426 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 33 *παρελθών*] + *δη* 426
 313 *ἐρωτήσουσιν*] pr και (+ *ει* 664) O-82 C'' f^{-56*} 527 128' Aeth Arm Syh
 318 *ὁ* A B 15' f 392 799 Bo] pr $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ rell
 320 *χείρα* A B 15'-72-707 628 68'-120' Tht Ex 103] + *μου* rell
 322 *χρυσᾶ*] pr *σκευη* 376' Latcod 100 Arm Bo^B Sa Syh
 44 *χείρα* 1° A B F 15*-707 121' 68'-120' 55 59 Phil I 108^{te} LatAug Loc in hept II 14] + *σου* F^b rell
 44 *κέρκου* 1°] + *αυτου* 426 Latcodd 100 101 Aug Loc in hept II 14 Serm VI 6 Concil (Cyr) I 5 Aeth Co Syh
 418 *λέγει* A B 15'-707 b 56'-129 392 z 799 Ach Sa] *ειπε* 551*; + *αυτω* 53' x; *ειπεν αυτω* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 425 *πόδας* A B 15-707 f 628 68'-120'] + *αυτου* rell
 429 *τήν*] pr *πασαν* F M O'(-72)-29-135 C'' d 246 n⁻⁶²⁸ s t y⁻³⁹² 18 55 59 76' 130 509 646 Latcod 100 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 52 *ἐστιν*] + (+ *ο* Tht^{ap}) $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ F^bvid 376 126 246 s^{-30'} 18 Tht Ex 105
 54 *ἔργων*] + *αυτου* 58-426 392* Aeth Syh; + *αυτ* F^b
 55 *fin*] + *αυτων* 58-376 126 Aeth
 510 *ἐργοδιῶνται*] + *του* (τουτου 646) *λαου* F M O'-29 C'' d n⁻⁶²⁸ s t y⁻³⁹² z 18 55 59 76' 130 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 510 *γραμματεῖς*] + *αυτου* O⁻³⁷⁶ Arm Syh; + *αυτ* F^b
 519 *τῆς*] pr *απο* F M O^{-15 426} C'' b d f n s t x y⁻³⁹² 128' 18 55 59 76' 130 509 646' Cyr Ad 192 Latcod 100 Syh
 66 *δουλείας* A B 82' z Ach Arab Sa] *δυναστείας αυτων* 77 19' 343; + *της σκληρας* x; + *αυτων* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 618 *Χεβρών*] pr και O-15 f(-129^{txt}) 121-527 Aeth Arm Syh
 629 *ὅσα*] pr *παντα* 15-58-376 Syh
 75 *χείρα* A* B 82' 120'] + *μου* rell
 79 *ῥάβδον*] + *σου* F^b O⁻⁵⁸⁻¹⁵ 126-131^c 610 Syh
 710 *ῥάβδον*] + *αυτου* F M O⁻⁷⁰⁷ C'' 44-106^(mg)-125' 458 s t y⁻³⁹² 18 55 59 76' 424 646 LatAug Ex 30 Ruf Ex IV 1 Aeth Arab Bo Syh
 719 *Ἀαρών*] pr *προς* F^b 426
 719 *τὴν χεῖρα* A 58-82' x] *τῇ χειρὶ σου* F* 15; + *σου* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 85 *τῇ χειρὶ* A B 970 426 56'-129 127 x 392 130] *τὴν χεῖρα σου* 126 537 53' = $\mathfrak{M}$; > 799; + *σου* rell
 89 *τοῦ* 1°] pr *περι* B 64^{mg}-376 d⁻¹²⁵ f⁻¹²⁹ s(-343) 84-370 392 55 130 799 LatAmbr Cain I 33 Aeth
 817 *χειρὶ*] + *αυτου* 15-376' 628 Latcod 106 Ruf Ex IV 3 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh
 817 *ῥάβδον*] + *αυτου* 58' Aeth Arab Bo
 829 *τοῦ* 1°] pr *απο* A^(c) M O'(-72)-15-64^(mg)-707 19' d f n s t y(-121) 18 646 Latcod 106 Bo Pal Syh

- 94 οὐ B 82 125 *f* 127-628 x 392 799] *και* 522*; pr *και* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
97 ἐβαρύνθη] pr *και* M 44 n *t*⁻⁸⁴ 18 Tht *Ex* 107
98 χεῖρας] + υμων O-15 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal
915 τὴν χεῖρα B 707 78^c 120¹ Latcod 104 Hi Is 18] > 246; + σου 53'; + μου rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
919 τελευτήσῃ] pr *και* 376 52'-761 619 68-122^c Aeth Arm
921 διανοίρα] + αὐτου 15-72-426 53' 30^cpr^m Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh; + εαυτου 58-376
922 τά] pr *επι* O-376-381' 25-500 *d*⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ n t x 121-527 68' 59 Aeth Pal Syh
933 τὰς χεῖρας B 82' b 125 *f*-246 127-628 x 392 120-128' 799 Or II 305 Latcod 104] *manum suam* Aeth^{MP} Arab Arm; + αὐτου rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
101 σημεία B 29' 44-610 *f*-246 127-628 x 392 68' 130 Latcodd 91 94-96 104] + μου rell
104 θέλης] + συ B O-72-15' 56-129 527 120-128' Arm Pal Syh
109 νεανίσκοις] + ημων (c var) A M O''-82' C'' 118'-537 *d*-125 246 75' s t y 68'-630 18 55 59 76' 130 509 799 Cyr *Ad* 201 IV 264 Aeth Arab Co Pal Syh
1012 χεῖρα B 707 19' 127 392] + σου rell
1022 χεῖρα B 82' C' b *f*n⁻⁷⁵ x 392-527 509 646' Latcod 104] + αὐτου rell
119 τέρατα B 29-82' 610 127 x 527 128' 18 55 76' Arm Syh] > 44; ∩ (10) 120; + μου rell
1211 ὑποδήματα B b *f*-246 120-128' 130 799 Cyr *Gl* 420 433 V 745 IX 976 1033 X 760 LatGregII Tr 9] + υμων rell
1211 αἱ βακτηρίαι B *f*-246 120-128' 130 799 Cyr passim Did Ps 62.16 Or IV 183 Tht *Ex* 117^{ap} LatGaud II 21 V 2] *baculus* GregII Tr 9; + υμων rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
1225 φυλάξεσθε] pr *και* d n t x 392 18 130 799
1231 βαδίσετε] pr *και* d-125 n-628 t x Aeth-^{MP} Arab
1232 ἀναλαβόντες] + καθάπερ ειρηκατε O-15 Latcodd 101 104 Pal Syh (α' + *sicut locuti estis* σ' θ' + *secundum quod locuti estis* Syh^L)
1234 πρό B 54 *f*-246 120-128' Bo] pr αὐτων (αὐτου 30*) rell
1250 Ἀαρών] pr τω 426
1315 ἀπέκτεινεν] + $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ Fb 15-376' *f*-129 130 799 Tht *Ex* 121 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
1410 οἱ 2°] pr ἰδου Fb O-15-707-708^c 106 *f*-129 n 85' 527 130 799 Cyr *Ad* 269^R Bo Syh
1412 ἀποθανεῖν] + ημας 58' 509
1423 ἀναβάται] + αὐτου 15-376 Arm Bo Pal
1426 τοὺς 2°] pr *επι* A F 29-376'-oI 52'-57'-313 118'-537 56' 85'-343-344^{mg}-730 527 509 646 Aeth Bo Pal Syh
1427 μέσον] pr *εις* 381'-707 126 *d**f*-129 n t 121' 68' 55 59 508 Latcod 111 Aug *Loc in hept* II 74
162 Ἀαρών] pr *επι* 426
165 τῇ 1° B F 82' 125 *f*n 392 120-128'-628 55 59 76' 130 799 Cyr *Gl* 449 VI 508] pr *εν* rell
1613 ὀρτυγομήτρα] pr η Fb 72 b 246
1614 init] pr *και* (> 58) ανεβη η θεσις (καταπανσις 58 Syh) της δροσου 15-58^{mg}-376' Syh (σ' Syh^L)
1616 ἕκαστος 2°] + τοις F O'-58^{mg} 82 19' 44' s t-84 318' 55* Arab Co Syh^{LxtT}
1618 τῷ] pr *εν* 15-376 509 Bo
1618 οὐκ 1°] pr *και* F M 29'-426-oI C'' 118'-537 *d* 85'-343' t x y-318 z 18 46 55 59 76' 509 646 Cyr *Gl* 453 Latcod 102 Ambr *Ep* VII 5 Syh (σ' Syh)
1626 συλλέξετε] + αυτο Fb O-58 (426^{LxtT})-15 Arm Bo Syh
1629 ἐκ] pr *εκαστος* A F M oI-29 C'' 44' s t x y-527 120-128'-628 18 46 55 59 76' 509 799 LatAug *Loc in hept* II 87 Arab Arm Bo^{AcB}
173 κτήνη] + ημων M O-58-15 *d* n-458 t 318-527 18 46 799 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh: cf $\mathfrak{M}$
177 κύριον] pr τον O-15 77 107'-125
1711 κατίσχυεν 1°] pr *και* x
183 ὄνομα] pr ω 426 Syh
186 γυνή B 58 739^c 118'-537 n 318* 120' Cyr *Ad* 280 Latcod 104(vi)] + σου rell
1814 λέγει] pr *και* 15-376' Arm Syh
1818 ποιεῖν] + αυτο 707^s C'' d n s t 646 Co Syh
1823 κατισχύσει] pr *και* F M 58-oI'-82 C''-54 *d*-106 *f*n s t x 392 18 46 76' 646 Bo^A Syh
1916 ἐπ' ὄρους] *επι* τον ορους F O-15-707
2011 τῇ 1°] pr *εν* O-15 C''-25^s b 44' n t 799 Tht *Ex* 131^{ap}
2012 μητέρα A B* Fb 56* 59 Matth 15a 1919 Marc 1019^{te} Luc 1820^{te} Eph 62 Phil I 270] + σου rell

- 213 γυνή] + αυτου 15-376-707 d⁻¹²⁵ n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t⁽⁻⁸⁴⁾ Syh
 2127 οίκέτου] + αυτου M O-15 b d 246 n t 318' 18 46 76' Latcod 100 Aeth Arm Co Syh
 221 αποδῶται] + αυτο 15-72-376 Co Syh
 2224 μαχαίρα] pr εν 15-376
 2226 πλησίον] + σου 15-72-376-707 30'-85^{ms}-130-321 γ⁻³¹⁸ Latcod 103 Ambr Tob 46 Spec 11 Arab Arm Bo^A Sa Syh
 234 αποδώσεις] + αυτα (αυτω 376*) 15-376 Bo; + id Aeth-PR Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2331 ἕως 1°] pr και 767 n⁻¹²⁷ s
 253 ἀργύριον] pr και A B O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15' 129 x 128'-407-628 426 646 Cyr Ad 593 Arab Arm Bo Syh
 254 κόκκινον] pr και A B 15'-72-376 118'-537 s 128'-407-628 55 76' 426 646 Cyr Ad 593 Arm Bo Syh
 256 τόν] pr εις b 392 Cyr Ad 593
 258 οὕτως] pr και Fa 15-72-376-707 19' d⁻¹²⁵ 246 n s t 527 126-128'-407-628 426 Latcod 102 Aeth Arm Syh
 2519 init] pr και Fb 72 125 246 126 Arm
 2537 τοὺς λύχνους 2° B 58-707-767 b 129 n γ⁻³¹⁸ 55* Cyr Ad 608 Latcodd 100 102 Arm] τοὺς λιθοὺς αὐτῆς 72; αὐτοὺς 29; + αὐτῆς (εαυτ. d 370) rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2618 στίλους 1°] pr τοὺς F 15-376 f⁻¹²⁹ 75 68'-120'-128' 55 426
 2626 σκηνῆς] + του ενος O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 Syh
 276 ἐκ] pr αναφορεῖς 15-376 Arm Syh
 277 πλευρά B 82'-767 19' f⁻²⁴⁶ 127 x 392 55 Latcod 100] δυο πλευρας z⁻¹²⁶ 18 426; pr δυο (δυο 319) rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 279 αὐλήν] pr την Fb 58
 2710 ψαλίδες B 82-618*-767 414' f⁻¹²⁹ x 392 76' 799] + eius Aeth; + αυτων rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2719 κατασκευή] + της σκηνης Fb O C" 318 Latcodd 91 94—96 Arab Arm Syh
 2719 καί 3°] pr και παντες οι πασαλοι αὐτῆς 376
 2719 οἱ] pr παντες O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Latcodd 91 94—96 Arm Syh
 2829 κώδωνας] + χερσους Fa O 131° d⁽⁻⁶¹⁰⁾ n s t Cyr Ad 744 Arm Bo^{A*B} Syh
 2830 ἀνθινον] + παρα ροισκον O Syh: cf $\mathfrak{M}$
 2930 τῶν B 82 414* 129 426] pr ο εκ M^{ms}; pr και 55; pr εκ rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2941 ὁσμήν A B Fa 15-82' f n s 527 55 426 799 Or IV 161 Bo] pr εις rell
 302 ὕψος] + αυτου O-707 527(2°) Latcod 100 Aeth Arab Arm Syh
 308 ὁψε] pr το M^{ms} O-72-707 d 56' n s t 527(2°) 392 59 799 Cyr Ad 617
 3019 χεῖρας B 15' 129 55 Arm Cyr passim] + αυτων rell
 3034 χαλβάνην B oII⁻²⁹ 527 55] pr και rell
 3115 τη 3°] pr εν O⁻⁷⁶⁷-82-707^I Syh
 3213 ὠμοσας B 767 129 n 55 319* 426 Latcod 100 Arm] + αυτους 799; + αυτοις rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 3220 πυρί] pr εν B 707-767 C"^{-14(1°)} d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ s t 424 646 Syh
 3230 εἶπεν B 15'-767 73'-550' b 125 53'-129 n 71' z 55 424 Arm Co] pr και rell
 332 τόν 2°] pr τον χαναναιον O⁻⁷⁶⁷ 44'-125 71' Ath II 560 = $\mathfrak{M}^L$; pr τον χαναναιον και A F M' oI-29 107' t 527 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 LatAug Ex 150 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}^{ms}$
 332 Χετταῖον] pr τον A F M' O'-29' C'-57' d 56' n s t 71' 121' 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 426 509 646'
 332 Φερεζαῖον] pr τον F O⁻³⁷⁶-29' C'-57' d 56 n s t 71' 318 126-128'-628 46 59 319 646'
 332 Εὐαῖον] pr τον 767 C'-57' d n s t 71' 318 646
 332 Ἰεβουσαῖον] pr τον 767 C'-57' d n s t 71' 318 646
 335 τοῖς] pr ειπον O-707 131° d n 344^{ms} t 318 18 LatLuc Conven 1 Arab Arm Syh; pr ειπε 527
 337 ἔπηξεν] + αυτην O⁻⁷⁶⁷ 318 Latcod 100 Luc Conven 1 Co Syh
 3321 στήση B 82 129° 55 LatAmbr Ps duod XLIII 91.1 Sa] στηθι 15 129*; pr και rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 342 ἀναβήση] + το πρωι F O-707 C"⁻¹⁴ 44-107' 127 s t 527 318 55 Latcod 103 Arm Syh
 349 καί 3°] pr ημων B O⁻⁷⁶⁷ C"⁽⁻⁵⁵²⁾ f n⁻¹²⁷ 799 Procop 689 Latcod 103 Arab Co Syh
 3411 Χαναναῖον] pr τον A F M' 29-82-376-767-oI C" b d 129 30'-85-343' t x 121' 68'-126-407-628-630 18 46 59 319 509
 3411 Χετταῖον] pr τον A F M' O⁻⁷⁶⁷-29 C" b d 30'-85-343' t x 121' z⁻⁴⁰⁷ 18 46 59 319 509
 3411 Φερεζαῖον] pr τον A F M' 29-58'-oI C" b d s t x 121' z⁻⁴⁰⁷ 18 46 59 319 509

- 3411 *Εύαιον*] pr τον A F M' 29-58'-oI C'' b d s t x 121' z⁻⁴⁰⁷ 18 46 59 319 509
 3411 *Ἰεβουσαιον*] pr τον A F M' 29-58-376-oI C'' b d s t x 121 z⁻⁴⁰⁷ 18 46 59 319 509
 3416 τὼν 1°] pr εκ O⁻⁷⁶⁷
 3429 ὄρους 1° B 15-707 n 71' 392 55 426 Chr XV 444 Cyr Gl 536 Or IV 471 Latcod 100 Sa] +
 σινα (c var) rell
 3429 Μωνσῆς 2° (c var) B 15-58-707 120' 55 426 Cyr Gl 536 Eus VI 99 Arm Sa] και 125 126
 Chr XV 444; > 376; pr και rell = **℞**
 3433 κατέπαυσεν] + μωνσῆς (μωσ. 58) A 58-376-767 318 Chr XV 444
 353 τῇ B 15' f⁻¹²⁹ 392 68'-120' 55 426 799 Latcod 100] pr εν rell
 356 κόκκινον] pr και O⁻⁵⁸ b 56' 392 68'-120' 799 LatRuf Ex XIII 3 Arab Arm Bo Syh
 358 τὸν ποδῆρη B M' O⁻²⁹ f⁻²⁴⁶ n 527 392 68'-120' 18 55 799 Latcod 100 Ruf Ex XIII 1
 Aeth^P Arab Arm Bo] pr εις rell
 3518 fin B 15 55] + εν τῷ αγω rell
 3525 κόκκινον] + το αλλοιουμενον O⁻⁵⁸ 131^{ms} Arm Syh
 3529 αὐτῶν] + αυτοὺς 376-767 128'-628
 3611 μερῶν B 15-707 19' f⁻⁵³ 127 71' 392 55 799 Latcod 100 Arm] ημερῶν 53; + αὐτου rell =
℞
 3616 τὸ μῆκος B F^h oII⁻²⁹ 552 53-56-129 n 71' 392 68'-120' 55 799 Latcod 100 Arm Bo] latum
 Latcod 104; om τό 19'; + αὐτου rell = **℞**
 3616 εἶρος B oII⁻²⁹ 108 129 n γ 392 68'-120' 55 Latcod 100 Arm Bo] longum Latcod 104; το ερ-
 γον 19; + αὐτης 53; + αὐτου rell = **℞**
 3620 fin] + εν τῷ χρυσῷ αὐτῶν O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Syh: cf **℞**
 3626 ἐπέθηκαν 2°] + αὐτας O⁻⁵⁸ Syh
 3626 πρόσωπον B oII⁻²⁹ 19' 53-56 n 71' 392 55 799 Latcod 100 Arm] + αὐτῶν 509; + αὐτου
 rell = **℞**
 3628 ἐπέθηκαν] + αὐτοὺς O Syh
 3628 συμβολήν] + αὐτου O Arab Syh
 3631 μέσῳ] + αὐτου O Arab Arm Syh
 3631 περιστόμιον] + αὐτου O Arab Syh
 3633 χρυσοῦς] (+ εκ 767) χρυσιον καθαρου O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 378 εἴκοσι 2° B 15-64^{txt}-707 19' 129 392 55 426 Latcod 100] + χαλκαι rell
 379 εἴκοσι 2°] + χαλκαι (c var) A F^h M' O⁻¹⁵(707^{txt}) 118'-537 d 56 n⁻¹²⁷ s t x 121' 128'-628
 18 46 59 319 509 799 LatAug Ex CLXXVII 13 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 3718 τῆς αὐλῆς] pr της σκηνης και F^h O Syh
 3720 Οὐρί] + υιου (c var) ωρ F^h O C'' 85'-130 Latcod 104 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh (ο' 344)
 3721 κοκκίνῳ] + (+ τῷ F^h; + το 376) νενησμενω F^h O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 383 χρυσοῦς B 15-707 19' d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ 127 t 71' 392 55 426 Latcodd 100 104] + (+ και 730 126) επι
 τα (> 664) τεσσαρα (c var) μερη (c var) αὐτης rell
 383 δύο 1°] + δακτυλίου O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 383 κλίτος 1°] + αὐτης O^{-376*} Aeth^C Arab Syh
 383 δύο 2°] + δακτυλίου O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 383 κλίτος 2°] + αὐτης O Aeth^C Arab Syh
 386 καί B 15-707 19' n 71' 392 68'-120' 55 426 Latcod 100 Pal] + ἐποίησεν (-σαν 314* 527)
 rell
 3812 τρυβλία] + αὐτης F^h O Arab Arm Syh
 3812 θύισκας] + αὐτης F^h O Arab Arm Syh
 3812 κνάθους] + αὐτης (-τους 376) F^h O Arab Arm Syh
 3812 χρυσᾶ] χρυσιον καθαρου O Arab Arm Syh
 3824 δικτυωτόν] + χαλκουν O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3911 καθά] κατα παντα οσα O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3914 τά] pr παντα O' 129 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3914 βάσεις] + αὐτης A F M' O⁻⁷⁰⁸ C'' 118'-537 s 121' 126-128'-628 18 59 319 Aeth Arab
 Arm Bo Syh
 3914 στύλους] + αὐτης O⁻³⁷⁶-708 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3919 Ἀαρών] + του ιερεως O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3920 στύλους] + αὐτης O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3921 καί 6°] pr τους καλους (c var) αὐτης O^(-G) Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh

39²¹ πασσάλους] + αυτης O^(-G) Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 39²¹ του] pr σκεπης O^(-G) Arm Syh
 39²² ὅσα] pr κατα παντα 767 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$; pr και παντα 72 Aeth^C
 40³ θήσεις] + εκει G-376-767 Arm Syh (οί λ' 85'-130-344)
 40¹³ χρίσμα] + αυτων G-767 Syh
 40¹⁴ πάντα] pr κατα O Arm Syh
 40¹⁶ κεφαλίδας B 15-707 14^s 19' f-²⁴⁶ 54-127 x 392 55 799 Lat^{codd} 100 103 Bo] -λας 426; βα-
 σεις αυτης F^b; + αυτων d t; + αυτης rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 40¹⁶ μοχλούς] + αυτης O Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 40¹⁶ στύλους B 15-707 19' 129 n 71' 392 68'-120' 55 426 Lat^{codd} 100 103] + αυτης rell
 40³² γάρ] + $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ O 343-344^c Arm Syh
 40³² Ἰσραήλ] pr οικου O C'' 85'-130 46 Arm^{ap} Syh (ο' 344)

This list is largely confirmatory of the conclusions reached from the earlier lists. Out of the 186 citations in the list all but 9 have at least one Greek O witness (97 12²⁵ 31 14²⁷ 16²⁹ 17¹¹ 18¹⁸ 25⁶ 35⁸); in other words the citations are indeed hex variants. Close to half the citations are popular readings (82), i.e. with the support of at least four text groups. For the remainder (104) the support from the text groups outside O gives no clear picture. In order of support they are as follows: f 8, d s z 6 each, C'' b n t 4 each, x 2, and y 1.

A partial analysis of the support for the popular readings shows that in 71 of the 82 citations O mss and at least two out of the three Byzantine text groups, d n t, are involved, i.e. the adoption by the Byzantine text of the hex readings ensured their widespread acceptance. Within these 71, 23 were not supported by n and one lacked d support. On the other hand, there were three cases of the remaining ten in which both O and n supported the variant; there were also four which were supported by d n t but not by any O ms.

D. One further area of hex activity deals with word order. Origen at times had to rearrange the LXX text to fit the Hebrew order which dominated his six-columned Bible. In *List 4* all instances except those already cited in *List 1* in which the variant text involves rearrangement of the LXX word order to conform to $\mathfrak{M}$ are given.

List 4

- 15 init — Αιγύπτω] ad fin tr O-15 Arm Syh
 17 και ἐπληθύνθησαν] post ἐγένοντο tr O-³⁷⁶-15 Syh(vid)
 112 αὐτοὺς ἐταπείνουν] tr 426 Arm Syh
 114 αὐτῶν / τὴν ζωὴν] tr 426 Arm Syh
 22 μῆνας τρεῖς] tr 426
 23 αὐτό / ἔτι κρύπτειν] tr A F M 29'-135-376'-oI C'' 19' d s-³⁰ t 121' 18 59 76' 130 509 646
 Cyr Gl 392 Lat^{Ruf} Ex II 4
 23 τὸ παιδίον / εἰς αὐτήν] tr 426 Arm
 210 αὐτόν] ad fin tr A F F^b M 58-64'-376-oII-⁸² C''-⁵²57*126761 d-⁶¹⁰ 56 75 s t-⁴⁶ x y 55 59
 76' 130 509 Cyr Gl 392 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh
 211 ἐαυτοῦ ἀδελφῶν] αδ. αυτου A F M 29'-135-376-oI-⁶¹⁸ C'' d 129-246 127-321-343' t 71 y
 18 59 76' 509 646 Cyr Gl 400 verss
 32 αὐτῷ] post κυρίου tr 58-426 Eus VI 235
 32 πυρὶ φλογός] φλογι (c var) πυρος A F O'-29'-135 C'' 108^(ms) d n 30' t y 128' 59 130 424
 509 Act 7³⁰ Thess II 18^{ap} mlt patres verss
 312 σε ἀποστέλλω] tr 426 56* 799 Co Syh

- 315 ὁ θεός / πάλιν A B 15' *b*⁽⁻³¹⁴⁾ 129 458 x 392 z 130 509 ^{Lat}cod 101 Bo] om ὁ θεός 527; om
 πάλιν 75 ^{Lat}Spec 134; tr rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 315 μού] post *ὄνομα* tr 426 Arm
- 315 γενεῶν γενεαῖς] tr 72-376 413-761 *b* 44 53' 628 318-527 Cyr VIII 953 Or I 42 Tht III 764
^{Lat}cod 101
- 317 καὶ Εὐαίων] post *Φερεαίων* tr 58'-707 628 30' ^{Lat}cod 100
- 318 σου / τῆς φωνῆς] tr 426 Carl 49 ^{Lat}codd 100 101 Aug *Loc in hept* II 11 Arm Syh
- 46 αὐτῷ κύριος] tr 376' 761 Ach Bo Syh
- 416 αὐτός σοι / προσλαλήσει] tr F M O'-58-29-135 C''-(73^{txt}) 126 *d* s-30' *t* 121-527 18 55 59 76'
 509 Cyr *Gl* 89 ^{Lat}Aug Ex 10 Syh
- 416 αὐτῷ ἔσση] tr 426 53'-56 628 30' 318' 130 799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ach Aeth Arm Co Pal
- 419 σου / τὴν ψυχὴν A B 15-82' *f*⁻²⁴⁶ *n* 30' x 392 z 799] tr (om τὴν 246) rell
- 423 μοι λατρεύση] tr O Co Syh
- 431 αὐτῶν / τὴν θλίψιν] tr O 126 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Syh
- 51 μοι ἐορτάσωσιν] tr A F M O'-29-135 C'' 19' *d*⁻⁴⁴ *n*⁻⁴⁵⁸ *s* *t* *y* 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 646'
 Arm Syh
- 55 νῦν πολυπληθεῖ] tr 426
- 515 οὕτως ποιεῖς] tr O⁻⁷² 527 Arm Co Syh
- 516 ἡμῖν λέγουσιν A B 835 15' *f* 68'-120'] *λεγ. ημιν* (c var) rell
- 68 ὑμῖν αὐτήν] tr A M O''-58¹³⁵ cII-52*54⁴²² *b* *d*⁻¹²⁵ *f* 628 85 *t*⁻⁸⁴ x *y*⁻³¹⁸ 18 55 59 509 ^{Lat}cod
 100 Arab Arm Co Syh
- 627 Ἀαρών A B 82' *b* *n* 30' x 392 z 130 799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ach Sa] et *Μωυσῆς* tr rell
- 71 σου προφήτης] tr 15-58' Syh
- 72 σοι ἐντέλλομαι] tr F M O''-82 (707^{txt}) C'' *d*⁻⁶¹⁰ *s* *t*⁻⁴⁶ 121 18 55 59 509 646 Cyr *Gl* 516 Aeth
 Arab Arm Co Syh
- 77 ἐτῶν ὀγδοήκοντα 1°] tr 15-58-426 Syh
- 716 μοι A B 835 58-82' *b*⁻³¹⁴ 129 *n* 30' 84 x 392-527 z 59 130 Iulianus in Cyr IX 653 ^{Lat}cod
 100] *μη* 314; > 318; post λατρεύσωσιν tr rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 724 ὥστε πειν / ὕδωρ] tr 58-426
- 81 μοι λατρεύσωσιν] tr O-15 126 76' ^{Lat}Aug *Loc in hept* II 38^{te} Arm Co Syh
- 83 φουράμασιν] et κλιβάνοις tr O⁽⁻³⁷⁶⁾-15 Arm Syh
- 84 τοὺς θεράποντάς] et τὸν λαόν tr F M O'-376-15-29-135 C'' *d* 53'-56*-246 75 *s* *t* 121' 68'
 18 59 76' 509 646 ^{Lat}Aug *Loc in hept* II 40 Aeth^C Arab Arm Bo Syh
- 88 ἐμοῦ λαοῦ] λαου μου O-15-381'-707 *b* 125 53'-129 *n* x 527 128' Or II 304 ^{Lat}Ruf Ex IV 4
 Arm Syh
- 820 μοι] post λατρεύσωσιν tr 426 *n* x 527 120' 76 Or IV 184 Arm Co Syh^{T*}
- 823 ἐμοῦ λαοῦ] λαου μου 15-376' 25 84 ^{Lat}Aug Ex 26 Arm Syh
- 823 σου λαοῦ] tr O⁻⁵⁸-15 ^{Lat}Aug Ex 26 Arm Syh
- 91 μοι λατρεύσωσιν] tr A M O''-82' C''(-25) *d* *n*⁻⁷⁵ *s*⁻⁷³⁰ *t* x *y*⁻¹²¹ 18 55 59 130 509 646' verss
- 94 τῶν Αἰγυπτίων] του *ἡλ* et τῶν υἰῶν Ἰσραὴλ] τῶν αἰγυπτίων O⁻⁵⁸-15 Pal
- 94 τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ υἰὼν B 56'-129 130] του οἰκου *ἡλ* x; κτηνων του *ἡλ* 84 318 55; κτηνων των
 (> 120-128') υἰων (> 121; + *omnium* Bo^{Ac} Sa) *ἡλ* (ισραηλιτων 107') A 29-58-135
 126-413 118-537 106-107' 458' 30'-85 *t*⁻⁸⁴ 121 *z*⁽⁻⁴⁰⁷⁾ 76' 646 Arab Bo^A Sa Pal Syh;
 κτηνων *ἡλ* 19' 44 628 59; om υἰῶν 54; υἰων *ἡλ* rell: cf $\mathfrak{M}$
- 924 τοιαύτη / οὐ γέγονεν] tr A M O''-7282' C'' 106 *n* *s* *t* *y*⁻⁵²⁷ 68' 18 55 59 509 646 Aeth Arab
 Pal Syh
- 933 αἱ φωναί / ἐπαύσαντο] tr O-15 Aeth Arm Pal Syh
- 934 αὐτοῦ / τὴν καρδίαν] tr A M O'-376-15-29-135 C'' *d* 628 85'-343' *t* 121' 18 55 76' 509
 Tht Ex 108 Arm Syh
- 101 αὐτοῦ / τὴν καρδίαν] tr A M O''-82 376^{txt} C''-52* *d* 53' 75' *s* *t* x 121' z 18 55 59 76' 424 646
^{Lat}cod 104 Aug Ex 36 Aeth^C Arab Arm Co Pal Syh
- 106 σου / αἱ οἰκίαι] tr O-15 527 Arm Pal Syh
- 1012 ἀναβήτην ἀκρις] tr 15-376' Syh: cf $\mathfrak{M}$
- 1014 τοιαύτη ἀκρις] tr O-15 Syh
- 1019 ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν] θαλ. την ερ. A M O'-15-135 C'' *b* 246 75' 85'-343' 121 68' 18 55 59
 76' 646 Aeth(vid) Arab Arm Pal Syh
- 1025 ὁλοκαντώματα] et θυσίας tr O-15 Pal Syh

- 1028 μου / τὸ πρόσωπον] tr O-15 422 d 30^c-730 t 392 59 ^{Lat}cod 101 Aug *Loc in hept* II 59 Arm Syh
- 1029 σοι — fin] εις προσωπον σου O-15 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh
- 111 μίαν πληγήν] tr O-376-15 Pal Sa Syh
- 111 ἐκβαλεῖ ὑμᾶς / ἐκβολῇ] tr A M O⁻⁷²-29 Cⁿ b d t 121 68' 18 55 76' ^{Lat}cod 101 Aeth Syh
- 113 init — ἔδωκεν] εδ. δε κς O-15 Aeth Arm Pal Syh
- 115 πρωτοτόκου παντός] tr O-15-707 Aeth^P Syh
- 1242 προφυλακή κυρίῳ] tr 58 b
- 133 ὑμᾶς κύριος A B M^s 135 25 b 125 127 s 619 γ⁻³¹⁸ 68' 18 799 Arm^{te} Syh] ημ. κς 707 75 ^{Lat}cod 104 Arm^{ap}; om κύριος Sa; + ο θς 130; κς υμας (aut ημ.) rell = **℞**
- 1311 σοι αὐτήν] tr 426 Arm
- 1316 χειρὶ κραταίᾳ] tr 15-376'
- 1318 ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν] θαλ. την (> 58) ερ. O-15 Syh
- 1319 μου / τὰ ὁστά B 82' 118'-537 n 30' 392 z] om μου 19'; tr rell = **℞**
- 1413 ἔτι] post αὐτούς tr F 15-29-426 d t 76' Syh
- 1430 τὸν Ἰσραὴλ] post ἐκείνη tr O-376-15 Syh
- 152 μου θεός] tr A F M 15-29 129 130 508 509 La
- 1519 ἐπ' αὐτούς / κύριος] tr A F 75 85-343' 121 59 Syh
- 169 ὑμῶν] ad fin tr F O-15 52-126 n 30' x 121 68' 46 130 509 799 ^{Lat}Aug *Loc in hept* II 83 Arm Syh
- 1619 εἰς τὸ πρῶτ] ad fin tr B O⁻²⁹ 126 b d⁻⁶¹⁰ f n 30' t x 318-527 120-128'-628 55 130 319 799 Cyr *Gl* 453 VI 512 ^{Lat}cod 102 Arab Arm Co Syh
- 1620 Μωυσῆς] ad fin tr B 82'-426 f n 30' x 318' 120-128'-628 130 799 Cyr *Gl* 453 VI 512 ^{Lat}codd 102 104 Arm Co
- 1629 μηδεὶς ἐκπορευέσθω] (+ και 376) μη εκπορ. μηδεις 15-376' Syh
- 1635 ἔτη τεσσαράκοντα] tr O-15 Syh
- 171 τῷ λαῷ / πιεῖν] tr O-15 126 n 30'-85'-130 ^{Lat}cod 102 Arm Pal Syh
- 176 Μωυσῆς οὐτως] tr O-376-15 53 Arm Co Syh
- 1715 μου καταφυγή] tr B O-15 108 76' Cyr *Ad* 273 ^{Lat}cod 104(vid) Ruf *Num* XIX 1 Syh
- 181 τῷ ἑαυτοῦ λαῷ] τω λαω αυτου O-15 422 19 ^{Lat}cod 104 Arm Syh
- 186 Ἰουδόρ] post σου 1° tr B 15-82'-376' 118'-537 f 120'-128-628 Cyr *Ad* 280 Arm Syh
- 1818 σύ 1° — τοῦτο 1°] το ρημα τουτο (> 72 Arm) ο (> 426 Syh) συ ποιεις (+ τουτο 72) O⁻⁵⁸-15 Arm Syh
- 1823 ἥξει — fin] εις τον τοπον εαυτου (aut. 376; tr τοπ. ε. 58) ηξει μετ ειρηνης O⁻⁷²-15 Syh
- 195 ἐμῆς φωνῆς B 82 118'-537 56'-129 n⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ 318 z 799] φωνης μου rell
- 1918 τὸν θεόν] post αὐτό tr B O-376-15 129 Bo Syh
- 2013-15 ordo commatum B 82 f 120' Sa] ordo 14 15 13 in 799; ordo 13 15 14 in C'-422 125 n⁻¹²⁷ 30' x Luc 1820 Rom 13⁹ Phil IV 276: ex Deut 517-19; ordo 15 14 13 in 84; ordo 15 13 14 in Matth 1918 Marc 1019 rell = **℞**
- 2017 γυναῖκα] et οἰκίαν tr F^b Arab
- 2020 αὐτοῖς Μωυσῆς] tr O-15 Bo Syh
- 214 μόνος] ad fin tr O-15 Syh
- 216 αὐτοῦ / ὁ κύριος] tr B O-15-707 n 30' 84 ^{Lat}codd 91 94 95
- 217 τις ἀποδίδεται] tr O-15 Arm Syh
- 217 ἑαυτοῦ θυγατέρα] θυγ. αυτου (εaut. 376) O-15 f⁻¹²⁹ 799 ^{Lat}Aug *Ex* LXXVIII 1 Arm Syh
- 2116 comma] post (17) fin tr 15-376 Cⁿ-14126414'422 30' Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 2120 τις πατάξῃ] tr O-15 Eus VIII 2.255 Syh
- 2121 διαβιώσῃ] post δύο tr 15-376 Eus VIII 2.255 Arm Syh
- 2126 τις πατάξῃ] tr O⁻⁷²-15 b 53' Cyr *Ad* 552^V Eus VIII 2.255 Arm^{te} Syh
- 2133 τις ἀνοίξῃ] tr O-15 Arm Syh
- 2134 αὐτῷ ἔσται] tr O-15 Syh
- 2135 τινὸς ταῦρος] tr O-15 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 30' Arm Syh
- 2136 ὁ ταῦρος / ὅτι] tr ^{Lat}codd 91 94 95
- 2136 αὐτῷ ἔσται] tr 15-376-767 n 30' Syh
- 221 τις κλέψῃ] tr 15-58-376 Cⁿ 424 646 Eus VIII 2.131 Arm Syh
- 226 τὸ πῦρ / ἐκκαύσας] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 53' ^{Lat}PsAmbr *Lex* 12 Syh
- 227 τις δῶ] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 53' Syh

- 2210 τις δῶ] tr 58' 129 Arm Syh^T
 2210 πρόβατον] et μόσχον tr B F^b O⁻²⁹ b 129 n 30' x 527 z 424 426 646 Arm Sa Syh
 2210 συντριβῇ ἢ τελευτήσῃ B 82 f z 424 799 Arm Sa] τελ. η κλαπη b; om συντρ. ἢ Aeth^P; om ἡ
 τελ. 426; τελ. η συντρ. rell = **℣**
 2211 ἔσται] post θεοῦ tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 Aeth Arm Co Syh
 2221 ἦτε γὰρ προσήλυτοι] πρ. γαρ ητε 58-376 Syh
 2314 τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ] ad fin tr 15-376 ^{Lat}Hi Agg I 1 Syh
 2331 τῆς ἐρυθρᾶς / θαλάσσης] θαλ. ερ. 58' 126 Syh; tr 15-376
 258 σοι δεικνύω B 82-767 b 129 127 s x 126-128'-407-628 426 ^{Lat}cod 102] tr rell
 2510 ἔξωθεν καὶ ἔσωθεν B 413-414*-761* 129 Cyr VIII 1381 ^{Lat}Concil (Cyr) I 15 Concil Tol 15
 Syh] om ἔξωθεν καὶ 458; ἔσωθεν (εωθ. d⁻¹⁰⁶) κ. εξ. rell = **℣**
 2532 τῷ ἐνὶ / καλαμίσκῳ] τω καλ. τω ενι F^b O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 44 318
 2538 ποιήσεις — (39) ταῦτα] post (39) fin tr A F M O^{-72 82} Cⁿ b d⁻⁴⁴ 129 n⁻⁷⁵ t^{-370c} y 128'-
 628 18 46 59 76' 426 509 La Arab Arm Syh
 268 τεσσάρων πῆχεων / τὸ εὖρος] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 ^{Lat}Ruf Cant 2 Aeth Pal Syh
 2610 ἀγκύλας πεντήκοντα] tr F^b 15-58-376 ^{Lat}Ruf Cant 2 Bo Pal Syh
 2618 βορρᾶν] et (20) νότον tr F^b Aeth^{CRa}
 2627 ὀπισθίῳ] post τῷ ult tr 15-376 Syh
 2632 βάσεις αὐτῶν / τέσσαρες] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 Syh
 279 μῆκος] post πῆχεων tr 15 Arm Bo Syh
 279 τῷ ἐνὶ κλίτει] τω κλιτει (c var) τω ενι O⁻³⁷⁶-15 n 30' Syh
 287 ἔσονται αὐτῷ / συνέχουσai] tr B 72 129 55 Cyr Ad 732 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 Pal Syh
 2811 λιθουργικῆς τέχνης] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Bo Pal Syh: **℣** hab אבן רש פר
 2817 στίχος λίθων] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Phil I 82^{ap}
 2828 κύκλω τοῦ περιστομίου] του περ. αυτου (> 72) κυκλω O⁻⁵⁸ Syh
 2830 init — κώδωνα] κωδωνα χρυσουν και ροισκον F^b Aeth^{CRa} Arm
 2833 ὑακίνθου κεκλωσμένου] κεκλ. υακινθινου (-κυνθου 72) O Syh
 2837 αὐτῶν / τὰς χεῖρας] tr O f⁻¹²⁹ 799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aug Ex 121 Arm Syh
 2838 ἀσχημοσύνην] post αὐτῶν tr O⁻⁷² ^{Lat}Hi Ep XXIX 5: cf **℣**
 2839 λειτουργεῖν] post τοῦ 2° tr 376
 291 ἐκ βοῶν / ἐν] tr O⁻³⁷⁶ Arm Syh
 291 ἀμώμους δύο] tr B O-82' b 129 n 30' 71' 55 Cyr Ad 749 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Syh
 2915 λήμψῃ / τὸν ἕνα] tr O Arm Syh
 2918 τὸν κριόν / ὄλον] tr B O-82' b 129 n 30' 71' 55 426 Cyr Ad 753 Arm Syh
 2935 αὐτῶν] ad fin tr A F M oI-29 Cⁿ d⁽⁻¹⁰⁶⁾ 56' t 527 y z 18 46 59 319 509 646' ^{Lat}cod 100
 Arm Syh
 3027 init — (28) σκεῦη 1°] post (28) αὐτῆς tr F^b O⁻⁵⁸-707^I n Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
 3028 αὐτοῦ / τὰ σκεῦη] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷-707^I 14 b 71' 126 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Syh
 316 σοι συνέταξα B 15-82' 118c-537 56 127 71' 392 55 426 799] σοινεταξα 118*; om σοι 767
 19'-314 53'-246 n⁻¹²⁷; tr rell = **℣**
 3222 τὸ ὄρημα] ad fin tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15' b z 55 426 ^{Lat}cod 104
 3227 ἐαυτοῦ ὁμφαίαν B 15'-707c(vid)-767 129 n 30' x 392 z 55] αυτου ρ. 707*; om ἐαυτοῦ 426
 Bas III 368; ὁμφ. εαυτου (aut αυτου) rell = **℣**
 332 τὸν ἄγγελόν μου] post σου tr 15'-58' 73'-550' z 55 Ath II 560 Cyr VI 648 Eus VI 238
 GregNys II 277 ^{Lat}codd 100 104 Aug Ios XXI 2 Iren IV 15.1 Arm Syh
 337 λαβὼν Μωσῆς] tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷ Syh
 3311 τις λαλήσαι] tr 58-376 Syh
 3311 ἐαυτοῦ φίλον] φιλ. αυτου (εαυτ. 58) O⁻⁷⁶⁷ 77 Tht IV 49 Arm Syh
 3312 μοι λέγεις] tr O 71' Tht III 1501 Arm Syh
 3312 χάριν ἔχεις] ευρες χαριν Tht III 288 1501 Aeth Sa = **℣**; tr 58' Arm Syh
 3317 τοῦτόν] et τὸν λόγον tr O⁻⁷⁶⁷ HymenHier 17 Syh
 3320 μου / τὸ πρόσωπον B 82 129 n 407 55] tr rell
 3320 ἄνθρωπος] post μου 2° tr 58' 246 ^{Lat}Ambr Ps duod XLIII 91.1 Syh
 3322 μου / ἡ δόξα B 15' 129 407 ^{Lat}Aug Gen ad litt XII 27 Trin II 28^{tc}] tr rell
 344 αὐτῷ κύριος] tr 72-376 Syh
 347 οὐ καθαριεῖ / τὸν ἔνοχον B 15' f⁻¹²⁹ 30' 318' 55 426 799 Cyr IV 420 VI 944 ^{Lat}Hi Ezech VI
 18 Co] pr καθαρισμω M^m 58-707-767 n 527 Eus VI 239 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 103; καθα-

- ρισμῶ τον εν. ου καθ. *d t*; non emundans eum^{Lat}cod 100; τ. εν. καθαρισμῶ ου καθ. 18; tr rell: cf **℞**
- 349 ἀμαρτίας] et ἀνομίας tr O-15' C-413 19 129 n 30' x 628 55 Procop 689^{Lat}cod 103 Arab Arm Co Syh
- 3428 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα B 129 120' Cyr Gl 536 Sa] om ταῦτα 15' 55; post πλακῶν tr rell = **℞**
- 3431 αὐτοῖς Μωυσῆς B 129] πρὸς αὐτοὺς μ. 15'-376 120'-126 55 426 Cyr Gl 536; πρὸς αὐτοὺς 107'-125 Chr XV 444; μωυσης (c var) πρὸς αὐτοὺς rell = **℞**
- 352 ἔργον / ἐν αὐτῇ] tr (c var) A F 836 oI-29-82 C'' d f s^{-30'} t 71' y^{-392'} z^{-68'} 55 59 319 509 646 Aeth Arab Syh
- 3518 init — ἱερέως] ad fin tr O Arm Syh
- 3521 αὐτῶν / ἡ καρδιά B oII⁻²⁹ b 56'-129 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ x 318' 55 799] εν τη κ. αυτ. 509; αυτω η κ. 53' 458; η κ. αυτου 376 Aeth Bo; αυτον 426; tr rell
- 3523 ὑακίνθινα] et κριῶν ἡρυνθροδανωμένα tr F^a F^b O-29 d t x 46 59 509 Aeth Arm Bo Syh
- 3528 τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ θυμιάματος] το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως C'' 121 = **℞**; την του θυμιαματος συνθεσιν O
- 3532 ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν] post ἔργα tr O⁻⁷² Arm Syh
- 361 τὰ ἄγια καθήκοντα] τα κ. τα αγ. O⁻⁷⁶⁷ 344^c Syh
- 364 αὐτοῦ ἔργον] tr O 53' 126 Arm Syh
- 365 φέρει / ὁ λαός] tr O⁻³⁷⁶
- 366 μηκέτι ἐργαζέσθωσαν] μη εργ. επι O Syh
- 367 αὐτοῖς ἱκανά] tr O Syh
- 3610 ἐποίησαν αὐτό / (11) ἐπωμίδας] tr O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 3612 αὐτοῦ ποίησιν] tr O⁽⁻⁷²⁾ Latcod 100 Aeth^C Arab Syh
- 3617 στίχος λίθων] tr G-376 Arm
- 3620 βηρύλλιον] et ὀνύχιον tr O Arab Arm Syh
- 3621 ἦσαν] post Ἰσραὴλ tr O Arab Arm Syh
- 3621 ἑαυτοῦ ὀνόματος] ον. αυτου O Arab Syh
- 3628 αὐτοῦ] post πρόσωπον tr O Arm Syh
- 3631 κύκλω τὸ περιστόμιον] το περ. αυτου (> Arm) κυκλω O Arab Arm Syh
- 376 τάς 1° — αὐτῶν / κατεχρυσώσαν] tr F^h O⁽⁻⁵⁸⁾ Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 3914 πρὸς Μωυσῆν] post σκηνὴν tr O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 3914 καὶ τὰς βάσεις (αυτῆς)] ad fin tr A F M' O^{-376 708} C'' s^{-30'} 121' 126-128'-628 18 59 319 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
- 3918 αὐτῆς / τὰ σκεῦη] tr O-707 73 129-246 527 z^{Lat}codd 100 103 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 406 τό — καρπαμάτων / θήσεις] tr 376-767 422 Arm Syh
- 408 αὐτοῦ] ad fin tr 1000 O 73 118'-537 f⁻¹²⁹ 71' 68'-120' 426 646' Latcodd 103 104 Arm Syh
- 4014 αὐτῷ] post κύριος tr 767 664 75 Syh
- 4015 τῷ δευτέρῳ / ἔτει] tr O Syh
- 4018 τὰ μαρτύρια / ἐνέβαλεν] tr O Syh
- 4021 ἄρτους] post προθέσεως tr O: cf **℞**
- 4032 ἐπ' αὐτῆς / νυκτός] tr O⁻³⁷⁶ Syh

Of the 184 citations in *List 4* plus the four from *List 1* 47 are popular readings supported by at least four text groups, all but two of which (29₃₅ 35₂) are supported by at least one O ms. Of the remainder seven are not supported by an O ms (15₂ 19 20₁₇ 21₃₆ 26₁₈ 27₉ 28₃₀); in no case is as much as one text group involved, though two of these (15₂ 19) are supported by A and F. For the rest the support is scattered and probably coincidence rather than a mark of recensional activity. Most of the remaining instances (132) are not supported by text groups other than O but only by scattered witnesses. The support by text groups (not more than two groups beyond O witnesses) is as follows: n 9, b 6, C'' f 4 each, x z 3 each, d t 2 each, and s 1. No clear picture of hex influence emerges from these numbers; in fact if one adds the support from the summary statements for *Lists 1*, 2, and 3 the picture is not all that

much more impressive. The totals in ranked order are as follows: *C*" 61, *n* 56, *d* 49, *t* 48, *f* 43, *s* 37, *b* 33, *z* 30, *x* 22, *y* 20. It will be noted that the Byzantine text in particular is supportive of the hexaplaric recension. The support is in some measure not quite as strong as might appear at first blush since much of the support is as might be expected strong in the popular variants for the earlier lists. But for *List 4* the imposed limitation on the count artificially reduced the count for *d n t* (i.e. of two groups plus *O*). Of these 43 popular readings 38 are supported by the Byzantine text (i.e. by at least two of *d n t*). This would change the ranking with *C*" in fourth place, and the three Byzantine groups occupying positions 1, 2 and 3.

E. The tradition has done well in preserving another aspect of Origen's work, viz. the marking of passages in the LXX which have no equivalent in the Hebrew by means of an obelus. In Exodus there are 334 passages more or less correctly marked in this way, and 25 instances of downright error. Occasionally, especially in *Arm*^{ms}, the obelus does not clearly delineate the precise dimensions of the intended passage since the sign is given only on the margin. As a result these signs are not always exactly at the right place.

Though Origen himself did not omit such passages it is possible that post-hex activity did eliminate such passages in order to "improve" the text. In the next list are given passages sub obelo omitted in the tradition. Not all such passages are given since scattered or incidental omission does not prove recensional activity. But omissions by any member of the *O* group, any other text group, any uncial text as well as omissions by *F*^b are included. Since all of these omissions equal *℞*, that fact is not recorded. Nor is the evidence for the obelus in the tradition included, all of which is found in *Arm*^{ms(s)} *Syh* and/or *G*; anyone interested in knowing what witness(es) had the obelus can consult the edition.

List 5

- 111 om καί 4° — fin 53'-56^c-246
- 211 om ταῖς πολλαῖς *F*^b 72 129 799
- 211 om τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραὴλ 426 318 59 *Lat*cod 100 *Aeth*
- 211 om τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραὴλ 58 75
- 222 om Μουσῆς *A* *F* 15-618 16-54 628 509 *Arab*
- 36 om αὐτῷ *B* 15'-707 56* 55 799 *Carl* 49 *Cyr Gl* 468
- 316 om τῶν υἱῶν *d t* *Iust Dial* LIX 2 *Aeth*^C
- 418 om μετά — fin *F*^b *Aeth*^{CG}
- 430 om ταῦτα *M* 376 *b* 246 628 *x* 527 18 55 509 *Lat*cod 100 *Aeth Arab Arm Co*
- 514 om τοῦ γένους *F* 708 78*(cpr m) 53' 59 *Aeth*^{CGR} *Sa*
- 66 om λέγων *F* *M*^{txt} 29'-72-135-426-*oI C*" *d n s t* 121 18 55 59 76' 509 646 *Lat*cod 100 *Ambr Cain* II 10 *Aeth Arab Bo Syh*
- 75 om πάντες *b* *Arm*
- 715 om αὐτός 72
- 720 om αὐτοῖς 44-107'
- 720 om αὐτοῦ 1° 72 *Arab Bo*^B *Sa*
- 820 om αὐτός *A** 44'
- 92 om τὸν λαόν μου 72 75 *Oxf* 4
- 98 om λέγων 58' *C*" 424 646' *Oxf* 4(vid) *Aeth*
- 99 om ἔν — τετράποσιν 72 106 53' *Arab*

- 924 om σφοδρά 2° B 29-135 C" b 44 f-246 75' 619 527 18 Latcod 104(vid) Arm Pal Sa
 928 om περι ἐμοῦ A M^{txt} O'-15-135-707 C" b 121 18 55 76' Or II 305 Aeth-M Pal Syh^{Ltxt}
 928 om καὶ πῦρ A*
 101 om λέγων 58' 125 458 84 x 799 LatAug Ex 36 Aeth
 101 om ἐξῆς 72 44
 104 om πάντα 72
 1026 om τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν 2° 707 b
 113 om αὐτοῦ 1° 58' b Aeth Pal
 118 om σου 2° 72
 1227 om αὐτοῖς 426 125 Or IV 422 LatAmbrst Quaest 96 Bo
 1312 om τὰ ἀρσενικά 1° F^b
 1312 om ἀγιάσεις A* F M^{txt} 29'-72-135-426-oI b 121 68' 18 46 59 76' 509 Phil I 239 244
 LatAmbr Cain II 2 Aeth Arab Syh
 1319 om Ἰωσήφ 2° B* Aeth
 144 om πάντες 118'-537 Did Ps 200.12
 1411 om γῇ F^b M O'-426-135-707 C"-78 b f-56 n-458mg s 619 527 128'-628 18 46 509 799 Ath
 III 445 Chr IX 292 434 Cyr Ad 269^V Or IV 153 LatRuf Ex V 4 Aeth Arab Sa
 1412 om ταύτη 58 Aeth Bo^A Sa
 1413 om χρόνον 58-707 75
 1417 om Φαραὼ καὶ 1° F^b
 1418 om εἰμι F^b 58-707 Aeth-R
 1429 om τεῖχος 2° 426 508 Latcod 111 Ruf Cant Prolog Aeth-R Arm Sa Syh^{Ttxt}
 1521 om λέγουσα 426
 1624 om αὐτοῖς oI Aeth^{FH}
 1629 om τὴν ἡμέραν ταύτην F^b 58 Arab
 188 om ἐκ 1° — fin F 29 x 55 59 509 Latcod 104 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 1816 om αὐτούς 58 Phil II 177
 1818 om ἀνυπομονήτῳ A* F 58-oI-64mg C"(-551) 121 68' 59 646 Aeth Arab
 1818 om τοῦτο 2° 58
 1819 om αὐτῶν 58
 1820 om τοῦ θεοῦ 58 Arab
 1821 om σεαυτῷ 15-58 422 125
 198 om καὶ ἀκονσόμεθα F^b 72 Arab
 1921 om λέγων 58' 107'-125 53' x Latcod 104 Aeth Arab
 2017 om οὔτε 1° — αὐτοῦ 1° F^{b1} Arab
 2022 om τῷ — ἀναγγελεῖς 58 Arab
 212 om σοι 58 Aeth
 212 om ἔτει τῷ 58 b 125
 213 om αὐτός 58 Sa
 216 om τότε 58 126 Aeth
 2113 om ὁ φονεύσας 58
 2114 om καὶ καταφύγη 58 Bo^{A*}
 2118 om δύο 58
 2119 om ὁ ἄνθρωπος 58
 2122 om δύο 58
 2135 om τὸν ταῦρον 3° 58
 2215 om αὐτῷ 58 426
 2219 om αὐτούς A F M^{txt} oI C" 118'-537 106 458 30'-85'txt-130txt-343' z 18 46 55^c 76' 424
 426 646 Arm
 2320 om σοι 58-767
 2323 om ὁ 58
 2328 om καὶ 3° 106 x
 2331 om τοῦ μεγάλου 58 53' 458 Latcodd 91 94 95
 241 om τῷ κυρίῳ 58
 258 om init — μοι F^b
 259 om μαρτυρίου F Hipp Dan XXIV 3 Latcodd 91 94—96
 2516 om ἐπίθεμα F^c 58 LatRuf Rom III 8 SedScot Rom 3 Arab

- 2527 om καθαρώ x^{Lat}cod 102 Arab
 2532 om καί 1° 58
 262 om ἔσται 2° 58 458
 268 om ἔσται 1° B 58 129 392 55^{Lat}Ruf Cant 2
 268 om ἔσται 2° 58
 2616 om ποιήσεις A F M 29'-767-oI C'' 118'-537 d n s t x 527 126 18 46 59 76' 509^{Lat}cod 102
 Aug Ex CLXXVII 5 Aeth Bo
 2616 om τὸν ἕνα F^b 58
 2635 om τῆς σκηνῆς 2° F^b 58
 2713 om ἰστία A* F 129^{txt} 76' 509^{Lat}Aug Ex CLXXVII 9 Aeth Arab Bo
 2713 om στυλοὶ — fin F^b 799 Arab
 281 om καί 3° 72 106
 281 om καί 5° 106-125 126 Aeth^{FGH}
 2812 om περὶ αὐτῶν F^b
 2817 om ἔσται F^b 58
 2824 om init — (25) πρόσωπον F^c(vid)^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth^{CRA} Arab
 2839 om πρὸς ἑαυτούς 58
 291 om αὐτούς 2° F^b 58 16 b 126
 295 om τὸν ἀδελφόν σου καί F^b
 2912 om λοιπόν 58 799
 2921 om τό 1° — fin 58 Arab
 2922 om αὐτοῦ 376 Arab Arm
 2929 om αὐτούς 58
 2934 om τῆς θυσίας 58 52-414*-500 71' Arab
 2938 om ἀμώμους 15-58 Cyr X 437 Arab
 2946 om εἰμι 72 C''
 303 om στρεπτήν F^b 58
 304 om καθαρούς F^b 58 321 Arab
 304 om στρεπτήν F^b 58 129 55
 3013 om ἐστίν 1° 58
 3023 om σίκλους F^c 426
 3032 om ἑαυτοῖς F^b 44 55 Bo
 3035 om ἔργον 2° 58 25
 3117 om ἐν 2° B* 550' 53' 319^{Lat}cod 104 Arm
 327 om λέγων 58 Arab
 3213 om λέγων 426 Aeth Arab
 3213 om τῷ πληθει 58 619 Arab
 3219 om δύο 72 77-131* 426 Barn XIV 3
 3220 om αὐτόν 2° A oI γ⁻³¹⁸ Phil II 35
 3220 om αὐτό F^c 127* Phil II 35^{Lat}codd 103 104 Arab Arm Bo^B Sa
 3222 om πρὸς Μωσῆν 58 125 Arab
 3229 om αὐτοῖς 58 73'-550' Bas III 368
 3231 om κύριε 15'-376 s^{-30'} 318' 55 59^{Lat}Aug Ex 147
 3234 om τοῦτον 58 Eus VI 238 Bo^A
 334 om ἐν πενθικοῖς 58 Bo^{A*} Sa
 3312 om μοι 3° 58-oI 25 n⁻¹²⁷ 84 59 509 Arab Sa
 3410 om πρὸς Μωσῆν A* 58 71' 121^{Lat}cod 103
 3410 om σοι 1° A
 3413 om καί 3° — fin 58 71' ^{Lat}cod 100 Spec 44
 3414 om ὁ θεός 58
 3416 om καί 2° — αὐτῶν 2° F^b 59
 3434 om πᾶσιν 58 53' 84 68'-120' Aeth
 355 om αὐτῶν 58 Arab
 356 om κεκλωσμένην F^b
 3511 om τοῦ μαρτυρίου F^b 58 Arab
 3515 om καί 1° 58
 3521 om πάντα 1° 767 Arab Bo^A

- 3522 om καὶ ἐμπλόκια F^b 58
 3531 om πάντων 58-767 53' Aeth
 3535 om συνιέναι 58-707 n 426 Lat^ccodd 100 103 Arab
 3610 om τῇ κεκλωσμένῃ 72
 3613 om ἀμφοτέρους F^h 58
 3624 om τοὺς χρυσοὺς 58
 3627 om ἐπ' ἄκρου 58
 3637 om αὐτῶν 58 509
 3638 om τὸ χρυσοῦν 58
 375 om τοῦ μαρτυρίου F^h Aeth^C Arab
 375 om χειροβίμ F^h Aeth^C Arab
 384 om init — διωστῆρσιν F^h 58-767 Aeth^C Arab
 3822 om ἐκ — συναγωγῆς F^h Aeth^C Arab
 3824 om αὐτῷ 58 Aeth^C
 392 om ἀνδρῶν F^h Aeth^C Arab
 3914 om τὰς στολάς 767 Aeth^C
 3918 om τῆς προθέσεως 58 Aeth^C Arab
 405 om τοῦ μαρτυρίου F^c 1000 Arab
 4020 om τοῦ μαρτυρίου 2° 1000 58 53' 527 426 Arab Arm
 4020 om τῆς σκηνῆς 2° 58 Arab

Even a casual reading of the above list will show the frequency of ms 58 as well as that of F^b. In fact there are 77 cases of passages sub obelo omitted by 58. This can hardly be coincidence: cf also THGD 46, THGN 65 and THGL 27 for more evidence. It should also be noted that in *Lists 1* and 2, i.e. for materials under the asterisk, there are 89 cases in which all O witnesses except 58 support the hex plus. In other words, the possibility must be reckoned with that the 58 copyist (or his ancestral text) not understanding what hex signs meant simply omitted text under a hex sign regardless of whether they were asterisk or obelus.

F^b constitutes a separate problem. It is actually a symbol used for all correctors of F in cursive script, correctors which can only rarely be differentiated. On the whole readings of F^b (or of F^h which is a specific cursive writer) are clearly close to $\mathfrak{M}$ but their text(s) is/are not really hex. The nature of these F^b readings, particularly their relation on the one hand to Compl and on the other to Pent (a late Jewish translation into Modern Greek) has been discussed in some detail elsewhere both by D. Fraenkel¹⁾ and by the writer in "A Secondary Text in Codex Ambrosianus" in a forthcoming (1992) *Festschrift* article.

Other support for the omission of passages sub obelo is insignificant. Of the O mss with more than five instances only 72 omits 13 instances, whereas there are eight cases of at least two O mss omitting such a passage. Among uncial texts A omitted 9, F 6, B 5, and M 2. Only two text groups omitted more than 5 cases, viz. *b* with 10 and *C* with 6. It may safely be concluded that the only two Greek witnesses with significant evidence for omission of materials marked with the obelus are 58 and the problematic F^b.

¹⁾ *Festschrift* R. Hanhart, MUS XX, especially Section V (174—184).

F. A final query about the nature of the O text concerns the possibility of preOrigenian revision of the Septuagint text, a matter that was hinted at in connection with cases of shorter texts in *List 1* above. The possibility of earlier recensional activity had already been raised in my study of the text history of Leviticus,²⁾ where omissions in the O text corresponding to texts under the obelus were discussed. The matter is equally cogent for the text history of Exodus.

In an earlier study, however,³⁾ I dealt specifically with this problem. In order to render this study of the hexaplaric text complete it might not be inappropriate to summarize briefly the results of that investigation. For the detailed evidence the reader should consult that earlier study.

Since early papyri remains for the Greek Exodus are both rare and extremely fragmentary, little evidence for possible Hebrew influence on variant texts was found, except in 805, a Qumran fragment from ca. 100 B.C., which shows traces of some recensional activity based on the Hebrew. For the Egyptian papyri fragments, 970, 908, 909, and 1000, no certain evidence for such recensional activity was present though a few possible instances do obtain.

Of more significance were cases of omissions, grammatical changes and lexical variants in the O tradition which correspond to $\mathfrak{M}$. Since Origen on his own testimony did not change his text but merely added such materials under the asterisk which corresponded to the Hebrew but were not present in his Greek text, nor did he omit materials which on comparison with his Hebrew were plusses in Greek, but rather placed such under the obelus, we may with some confidence conclude that when O represents a text shorter than Exod but corresponding to $\mathfrak{M}$, Origen's text had already been revised in the direction of the Hebrew. So too the grammatical and lexical changes which corresponded to $\mathfrak{M}$ may be taken to represent such possible prehexaplaric revisions in the text of Origen.

When the evidence had been gathered and considered it was clear that the possibility of some kind of preOrigen recensional activity had been established. Furthermore when this material was compared to the B text and the A text it was clear that Codex Vaticanus showed barely any possible traces of such activity, whereas Codex Alexandrinus showed a fair amount of such.

It should, however, also be said that the type of possible recensional activity found was on the whole casual. No trace whatsoever was found of the kind of revision identified by Barthélemy⁴⁾ as belonging to revisers of the *καίγε* group.

Since Codex Alexandrinus showed some support for the preOrigenian recensional activity found in the text history of the Greek Exodus, the possibility of Egyptian (vs Palestinian) recensional evidence is an intriguing possibility which admits of no certain answer.

²⁾ THGL, MSU XIX; cf especially pp. 28—33.

³⁾ J. W. Wevers, PreOrigen Recensional Activity in the Greek Exodus, MSU XX, 121—139.

⁴⁾ D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*. VT Suppl. 10. Leiden, 1963.

Chapter II: The Byzantine Text Groups

From THGG it appeared that the groups *d n t* were closely related; in fact, in chh. 34—43 the *n* group disappeared completely being assimilated into *d* (cf p. 109), and for chh. 44—50 *t* also had no separate existence from *d* (p. 136). For Lev, Num and Deut these three were also closely related and it was taken for granted that they constituted the Byzantine text. This designation rested in part on the fact that the text in the Lectionaries for Genesis was basically a *d* text; cf THGG ch. 11.

As in the case of Lev, Num and Deut this text will be examined for possible recensional activity particularly for Hebrew influence.

A. Possible Hebrew influence on the Byzantine text is most likely to have been mediated through hex, and *List 1* accordingly presents materials under the asterisk in the tradition. Patristic evidence will not be given.

List 1

- 311 εἰμι] pr (※ Syh) ἐγώ 58-376 128' Syh; + (※ Arm^{ms}) ἐγώ A^c B F^b 15'-72-135*-426-οΙ 126-550' b n⁻⁶²⁸ 527 55 130 509 Lat^{cod} 100 Arm Sa
 46 τὴν χεῖρα 1° 73 b 129 n⁻⁶²⁸ x Lat^{cod} 101] αὐτὴν 107'-125; + (※ Arm^{ms}) αὐτοῦ 843 rell
 46 αὐτοῦ ult] + (※ Syh) λεπρῶσα 376' d⁻⁴⁴ f⁻¹²⁹ t 71 392-527 76' 130 509 799 Arab Arm Bo Syh
 47 τὴν χεῖρα] + (※ Syh) αὐτοῦ A O-29-618 52'-78-126-313'-414*-422 106 53' n⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ t y 59 Lat^{cod} 100 Arm Co Syh
 616 ἐπτά] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) ἐτὶ 29' b 107' 664 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t y⁻³¹⁸ Ach Arm Bo^A Sa Syh
 925 ἀπό] pr (※ Arm^{ms} Syh; cvar) πάντα ὅσα ἦν ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ B^{ms} M^{ms} O-15-135^{ms}-707 b d n⁻⁶²⁸ t x y⁻¹²¹ 55 Lat^{cod} 104 Arab Arm Bo^B Pal Syh
 101 τῶν] pr (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) τὴν καρδίαν O⁻⁷²-15 b 107' n 85'^{ms}-344^{ms} t Arm Bo^B Pal Sa Syh
 1012 γῆν 2°] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) αἰγυπτου 15-376'-707 19' 246 127 30' t 392-527 Lat^{cod} 104(vid) Arm Pal Syh
 1021 χεῖρα M 64^{ext}-135-707-708 106-107 127 30-343' 370 x 18 55 130 509] + (※ Arm^{ms}) σου rell
 112 καὶ 3°] + (※ Syh) σκευὴ 15-376' 127 30' t 527 Arm Bo^B Pal Sa Syh
 117 καὶ B 82' b f⁻²⁴⁶ x 392 120-128' 130 799 Sa] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh; cvar) ἀνα μέσον rell
 1232 πρόβατα] + (※ Syh) ὑμῶν O⁻⁷²-15-707 d⁻¹²⁵ n t x 318-527 Aeth Arab Co Pal Syh
 1311 ὄμοσεν] + (※ Syh) σοι (sub ※ Arm^{ms}; σε 44) καὶ F^b O-15-707 d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ n t x 392 Arm Syh
 1410 ὀφθαλμοῖς] + (※ Syh) αὐτῶν F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15 d t Arm Co Syh
 1411 ἐξαγαγὼν B 58-82 422 19' 56^c-129-664 120-128'-628] -γεῖν 68'; ἐξαγῶν 53; + (※ Syh) ἡμας rell
 1418 ἵπποις] pr (※ Syh) ἐν (> 44 318 Co) τοῖς F^b M^{ms} O⁻⁷²-15-82'-381' C'' 19' 44-107' 53' n s t x 318-527 z 46 76' 509 Arab Arm Co Pal Syh
 185 υἱοί] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτοῦ F 15-376' 131^(c) 19' 44' n t Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 2025 ἐγχειρίδιον F οΙ C''⁻¹²⁶ 131^c 129 x 120' 76' Aeth^{FH} Sa] -χειρίον 59; + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) σου (μου A) rell
 215 γυναῖκα A B 58 b 125 129 z 59 426] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) μου rell
 215 παιδίᾱ] + (※ Syh) μου F O⁻⁵⁸-15-707 C'' d 75 t x 318-527 59 76' 424 509 646 verss

- 216 οὐς] + (※ Syh) αὐτου O-15 *d n t* Latcodd 91 94 95 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh
 2122 δώσει — fin B 82' 129 *n* Latcodd 91 94 95 100 Sa] > 25 628; pr (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) και rell
 2135 πησίον] + (※ Syh^L) αὐτου O-58-15 C'' *n*-127 318 646 Latcod 100 Arm Bo Syh
 2212 κυρίω] + (※ Syh) αὐτου Fb 72-767-oII-707 C'' *d f*-129 *n*-127 85^{mg}-130^{mg} *t x* 318' *z* 59 426
 509 646' Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 2214 κύριος] + (※ Syh) αὐτου 15-72-376 *f*-56* *n*-127 628 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh
 2215 κύριος] + (※ Syh) αὐτου 15-58 C''(-16 131) *f*-56* *n*-127 *y*-392 128'-628 76' 424 426 646
 Arab Arm Sa Syh^L
 254 ὑάκινθον] pr (※ Syh) και A B F M O'-64* 767-15' 44-107' *s t x* 392 128'-407-628 18 46 55
 59 76' 426 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 2920 χειρός] + (※ Syh) αὐτων O-58 Syh = **℞**; + (※ Arm^{ms}) αὐτου Fa *n t* 318 509 Aeth Arm
 2928 σωτηρίων] + (※ Syh) αὐτων M^{mg} O-58 *d n t* 392 Latcodd 91 94—96 Aeth Arm Syh
 306 μαρτυρίων] + (cvar; ※ 344 Syh; + και 458) κατα προσωπον του ιλαστηριου ο εστιν επι
 των μαρτυριων M^{mg} O-58 131^{mg} *d* 246 *n*-75 344^{mg} *t* 318 128'-628 18 55 Arab Arm Syh
 3019 πόδας] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτων O-707^I C'' 19 *d n t* 527 318 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
 3034 ὄνυχά] pr (※ Syh^L) και M O-767-29-707^I C''(-761) *d f*-129 *s t* 392 *z* 18 46 319 424 509 646'
 Arab Arm Bo Syh
 3115 θανατωθήσεται B 55^{txt}] pr (※ Arm^{ms}) θανατω (cvar) rell
 3212 ἀποκτείνει] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτους 376-767 C'-131-422 *d* 56' *n t* 318 426 646' verss
 3232 ἁμαρτίαν] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτων B M' 376-767-oII-29 C''-25 52 413 422 44-125' 129 *n*
 30'-130-321'-344 *t*-84^{txt} 527 318 55 426 509 646 Latcodd 100 103 Arab Arm Co Syh
 334 fin] + (cvar; ※ M 344 Arm^{ms} Syh^L-vid) και ουκ εθηκεν ανηρ κοσμον αὐτου επ αὐτου Fa
 M'^{mg} O 131^{mg} *d n* 344^{mg} *t* 18 55* Arab Arm Syh
 335 κύριος] + (※ Syh^L) προς μουσην (cvar) Fb O-707 131^c *d* 246 *n* 344^{mg} *t* 527 121^{mg}-318 *z*
 18 Arab Arm Syh
 337 σκηνήν 2°] + (※ Syh^L; + την 107 74') του μαρτυριου O-58-707 *d n t* 527 318 Latcod 100
 Arab Arm Syh
 337 ἔξω 2°] pr (※ Syh^L) την B O'-29 73'-550' *b d n t* 527 426 Sa Syh
 3323 χεῖρα] + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) μου Fa M' O-767*-15' 16-25-57-77-131^c-500 *d f* 75*-127
 130-321' *t* 527 318 126 18 46 59 426 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh
 3412 μή 767 *n* 426] ινα μη 121; + σοι B 15'; + πως 55 Bo; + (※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) ποτε rell
 3435 κάλυμμα] (※ Syh) το κάλυμμα (cvar) A F M' 29-72-82-376-oI C'' *d f*-129 *s t x*-71* *y*
 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 646' verss
 357 fin] + (cvar; ※ Arm^{ms} Syh^L) και ελαιον εις το φως και αρωματα εις το ελαιον της χρεισεως
 και εις το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως O-58 131^{mg} *d* 127 *t* 121^{mg} 128'-628 55 Arab Arm Syh
 367 ποιῆσαι] + (※ Arm^{ms}-vid Syh) αυτα O-707 19' *d n t* 318 Arm Syh

These 44 instances show a certain amount of hex influence on the Byzantine text. These plusses can be amplified by plusses in the tradition which equal **℞** but have presumably lost the signs. A complete list of these plusses was given in *List 3* of Chapter I to which the reader is referred.

A survey of this list shows another 88 instances of plusses that equal **℞**, most of which are hex in origin. A large number (36) of these concern pronouns, all but two of which (1818 3213) being in the genitive. A number of instances add an article (1616 308 332 (4 times) 3411 (5 times), and others the conjunction και (947 1225 31 1618 1823 2330 258 3034 3230 3321 3429). The following prepositions are added: απο (519 829), εις (1427 2941 358), εκ (2930), εν (165 2011 3220 29 353), επι (922), and περι (89). In three cases (3518 23 383) an entire prepositional phrase is added. Verbs are supplied twice: ειπον (335) and εποιησεν (386), as well as the indeclinable ιδου (1410). And finally, a number of nominals occur. These are 318 $\overline{\kappa\varsigma}$, 429 πασαν, 510 του λαου, 1629 εκαστος, 277 δυο, 2829 χρυσοys, 332 τον χαναναιον, 342 το πρωι, 3429 σινα, 378 χαλκοι, 379 χαλκαι, and 385 καθαρου.

Most of these are also supported by at least one ms of O and may safely be considered hexaplaric in origin. There are, however, six plusses where no O ms supports the reading. These are *και* at 12²⁵ 31, *εις* 14²⁷, *εκαστος* 16²⁹, *αυτο* 18¹⁸, and *εις* 35⁸. Some of these are popular readings, and little can be said about so short a list.

Further support for a revised text deals with the transpositions made to conform to the Hebrew. A complete list was made as *List 4* in Chapter I. In 53 cases the Byzantine text (i. e. at least one of the Byzantine groups) supports the transposition. In only two of these (29³⁵ 35²) is there no O ms part of the support. In the first of these the support is quite massive, viz., A F M *oI*-29 C'' *d* 56' *t* 527 *y z* 18 46 59 319 509 646' ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Syh. The second has even more support, viz. A F 836 *oI*-29-82 C'' *d f s*-30' *t* 71' *y*-392* *z*-68' 55 59 319 509 646 Aeth Arab Syh. Both instances show support of the hex versions Arab Arm and/or Syh, and both are found in *oI*. It seems quite appropriate to name hex as the source for all 53 cases.

It must now be explored whether *d n t* show any recensional activity apart from hex. In the next list all further instances in which the Byzantine text equals $\mathfrak{M}$ are given.

List 2

- 1¹⁹ Αἰγύπτου] -ται (-τιοι 458) F^b 58'-64^{ms}-426 57* *b n* 30'-321^{ms} Arm Syh
2¹⁸ om αὐταῖς *d t*
3¹³ αὐτῶ] αὐτου 15'-58'-376* 106 53' *n*-628 Aeth Arm Co
3¹⁶ τῶν υἱῶν] sub ÷ Syh; > *d t* Aeth^C
4⁵ om σοι 1° B^c 707* *d*-44' *n t* 76 509 Arab Bo
4⁷ om πάλιν 2° 72 126 *n*-628 730 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Bo
4⁸ om σοι 2° 72-376-618* 73-413 44-125' 458 799 Aeth-CP
4²³ εἰ — βούλει] συ δε ουκ εβουλου (cvar) F M *oI*'-15 C''-131^c *d n s t y*-392 128' 18 55 59 76'
509 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Arab Bo Syh^{Lmg}
4²³ αὐτούς] αυτον F M O''-15' C'' *d n s t x y* 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 Ach Aeth Arab Arm Bo^B
Sa Syh
4²⁷ κατεφύλισαν ἀλλήλους] -σεν (cvar) αυτον F M^{txt} O'-29-135 C'' 118'-537 *d n s*-85^{ms} *t y*-392 18 55 59 76' 509 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
5¹ αὐτῶ] προς φαραω F M O C''-126 107' *t* 18 59 424 509 Aeth-CH Arab Bo Syh
5⁷ προστεθήσεται] προσθησετε F^b O'-376 708-15 C'-14-25-414-422-551^c 537 106^c 628 *t* 121' 128' 646 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth
6⁶ λέγων] pr ÷ Arm^{ms}; > F M^{txt} 29'-72-135-426-*oI* C'' *d n s t* 121 18 55 59 76' 509 646
^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Arab Bo Syh
6²⁶ ἐξαγαγεῖν] -γετε (-ται 75) *n*-458
6²⁷ καὶ ἐξήγαγον] ωστε (> 15*; + και 127) εξαγαγειν F M O''-(72) 82 C'' *b* 106-107 127 *s t x y*-392 18 55 59 76' 646' Aeth Arm Bo Syh
7¹ om λέγων F M O''-15' 376 C'' 118'-537 44'-125 628 *s x* 121-527 18 55 59 76' 509 646
verss
7² om αὐτῶ F M^{txt} O''-58 82 (707^{txt}) 118'-537 *d n s t* 121 18 55 59 76' 509 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth-^{CG}
Arab Bo Syh
7⁷ om ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ F M^{txt} O''-82 C'' *b d n s t* 121 68' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth Arab
Arm Bo Syh
7⁷ ἐλάλησεν] -σαν A M 29'-135-381'-426 25 *b d* 53'-246 127'-458^c *t*-84' *x y* 68'-128' 18 55
130 509 646' ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Arm Syh
7⁹ om ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν F M O''-82 C'' *b* 107'-125 *s x* 121' 18 55 59 76' 509 646' Aeth Arab Bo
Syh
7¹² om ἡ 2° 15-72-376-707-*oI* C'' *b d f n* 321-343 *t x y*-392 68'-128' 18 55 130 509 646' Co
Syh

- 720 αὐτοῖς] pr ÷ Syh^T; sub ÷ Syh^L; > 44-107'
815 ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδία] εβαρυνεν την καρδιαν F^a d n t Sa
828 θύσατε] -σετε M 15-29-72-135 d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ 53' n⁻⁶²⁸ s⁻³⁰ t⁻⁴⁶ x 121 68' 55
829 σου 2°] φαραω M O^{''-64mg} (72) 82 C^{''} 118'-537 d s^{-321mg} t 121' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth
Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh
829 σου 2°] αυτου M O⁽⁻⁷²⁾-15-707 d n⁻⁶²⁸ t 18 646 Arm Bo Pal Syh
92 ἀλλ'] και A M O⁻⁵⁸-15-29-135 118'-537 d n⁻¹²⁷ s t 121 18 55 59 509 Aeth Syh
92 αὐτοῦ] αυτους 15-64*-72-135-707 C^{''(-126)} b 107'-125 n⁻¹²⁷ 392 128' 59 646 Aeth
98 ὑμεῖς] υμιν (ημ. 618) A M oI-29'-135 C^{''} b⁻¹⁹ d s⁻³⁴³ t γ 18 59 424 646 Aeth Arab Bo
910 ἔλαβεν] -βον A 29'-58-82-426-oI C^{''-54} 77 (414' 550'txt 761) d n⁽⁻⁷⁵⁾ t⁻⁸⁴ 121' 55 76' 130 509
646 799^c Aeth^C Arm Bo Pal Syh
914 om ἄλλος A M O^{''-82} C^{''} d 246* n s t x γ 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth Arm Pal Sa Syh
924 om τό d x
1010 ἀποστέλλω] -στελω 29'-72-82 126 b d 628 t x 318 Sa
1014 ἀνήγαγεν αὐτήν] επηλθε(ν) η ακρις (absc 64) 64^{mg}-707 118'-537 246 n 392-527 Latcod
102 Syh^{Lmg}
1025 ἄ] και 707 246*(vid) n⁻¹²⁷ s^{-85'mg}
1110 om τὰ σημεῖα καὶ A* O⁻⁵⁸-15-64'-707 C^{''-57'mg} b⁻¹⁹ 246 n 30'-85-321txt-344txt 121' 68'
55 59 646 Latcod 102 Aeth Pal
1110 ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ (-του 53' 120) A B 58-82 f 458 x 120-128' Arm] om γῇ 130 799; > rell
127 αὐτά] αυτο A O⁻⁴²⁶-15-381' 57 d 246 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 85'-343' t 121-527 68' 799 Aeth Arm Sa
Syh
1245 ἡ B M^{mg} 82 56-129 x 392 120 130 Sa] δε και 527; και rell
1248 ποιῆσαι 1° B 82 f x 318 120-128' 130 799 Latcod 104 Aeth^C Sa] και ποιησεις 458; και
ποιη (cvar) rell
1314 αὐτῷ] προς αυτον O-15 b n⁻⁷⁵ 30'-85txt-321-343-344txt Syh^{LtxtT}
1315 πρωτοτόκων 1° B 82' 14-126 b f n s⁻⁷³⁰ x 318' 128'-628 130 Sa] ∩ 2° 120; -κου rell
1315 idem 2° B 82 126 b f n 85'-343' x 318' 128'-628 Arm^{te} Sa] > 707 125 Aeth; -κου rell
1411 ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ] ἐν γῇ sub ÷ Syh^L; sub ÷ Syh^T; > F^b M O^{'-426}-135-707 C^{''-78} b f⁻⁵⁶
n^{-458mg} s 619 527 128'-628 18 46 509 799 Aeth Arab Sa
151 θεῶ B 58-82 131(mg) 19' n⁻⁷⁵ 392 120-128'-628 130 508 Latcod 111 Arm Sa] > 707^c; κω
rell = 𐤀𐤕
1615 αὐτό (-τω 376) B 15'-58'-376 f γ⁻¹²¹ 120-128'-628 130 799 Arm Sa] > rell
1616 σὺν] εν A F O^{'-58mg} 82 C^{''-78} b d 53' 127mg s t γ 68' 55 59 76' 646 Arab Co Syh^{LtxtT}
1629 εἰς τοὺς οἴκους ὑμῶν] παρ εαντω M^{mg} 29-426 d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 30'-85'txt-130-343-344txt t 509 799
Aeth Bo Syh^{LtxtT}
172 λέγοντες] και ελεγον A F M 15-29-376'-oI C^{''} d s t x γ⁻³¹⁸ 68' 18 46 55 59 76' 509 799 Bo
Syh^{LtxtT}
175 om τούτου A F M O^{'-58} 82 d n 30'-85-343' t x γ⁻³¹⁸ 18 46 55 59 76' 509 Latcodd 102 104
Aeth Arab Arm Bo^B Pal Sa² Syh
183 αὐτῶν B M 29-82-376 f s⁻³²¹ 318 120'-128-628 18 46 76' Co] αυτου 321; > rell
1810 ὅτι] ος 58' 19' d 246 n⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ 30'-85txt-130txt-321-343' t x 646 Latcod 104 Aeth Arab Arm
1921 λέγων] sub ÷ Syh; > 58' 107'-125 53' x Latcod 104 Aeth Arab
218 αὐτῷ καθωμολογήσατο] (cvar) ου καθωμ. αυτην A F O^{''-707} d s^{-130mg} 730 t 121' 68' 55 59
76' 424 509 646 Arab Bo Syh
224 τε B 29-82 f⁻²⁴⁶ 318 799] ras 2—3 litt 74; > rell
2210 γνῶ] ιδε (ιδει 75') 15 118'-537 n⁻¹²⁷ 85txt-321 Syh^{LtxtT}
2220 om ὁ oI C^{''-126} n 59 646
2223 φωνῆς] βοης F M O⁻³⁷⁶-29'-64' d 56' 127 s t⁻⁷⁴ γ 46 55 59 509 799 Aeth Arm Syh
2225 ἀδελφῷ] λαω F M^{txt} oI-29' 118'-537 d 130^{mg}-321^{mg} t 318 18 46 55 59 76' 509 Latcod 103
Aeth Arab Bo
2228 ἄρχοντας B 15'-376 30-85-343'-730^c x 527 Arm^{ap} Sa Syh] αρχοντ 458; αρχοντα rell
237 om ἐνεκεν δώρων F O⁻⁵⁸-15-707 d n^{-127^c} s t 527 55 509 Aeth Bo Syh
2321 om καὶ 2° A F M 29'-58-oI C^{''} b d t x γ⁻³¹⁸ 120'-128'-628 46 55 59 319 426 509 646
Latcod 102 Arab Bo Syh
2321 ἐπ'] εν n⁻¹²⁷ 730* γ⁻⁵²⁷ 120'-128'-628 426 646
2325 σου 1°] υμων 707-767^c n Sa

- 2325 om *καὶ τὸν οἶνόν σου* A* 15-707^{txt}(vid)-767 n 30-85^{txt}-130-321-343'-730* x 527 Lat^{cod}
102 Arm Bo^B Sa Syh
- 246 *πρός]* *ἐπι* 376 107'-125 f-56* 458 30' 84 799
- 2414 *εἶπαν]* -πεν A F M oI-29 C''-126 422 d-44 127 t 318 68' 18 46 424 509 646 Lat^{cod} 102 Arab
Bo Syh
- 2415 *καὶ Ἰησοῦς* B 82 f n-127 392 128'-407-628 76' 426 646' Aeth^C Bo^B] > rell
- 252 om *καὶ* 2° A F M 29-767-oI C'' b d(-106) n s t x y 68' 46 59 424 509 799 Lat^{codd} 91 94—
96 Aeth^C Bo Syh
- 2521 om *καὶ* 3° M O-376-15-707 57* b 246 n s x 392 126 18 46 Lat^{cod} 102 Aeth Arab Arm
Syh
- 2537 *φανοῦσιν]* *φανει* 707 n-127 Lat^{codd} 91 94 95
- 2616 *ποιήσεις]* sub ÷ Syh; > A F M 29'-767-oI C'' 118'-537 d n s t x 527 126 18 46 59 76'
509 Lat^{cod} 102 Aeth Bo
- 2710 om *αἱ* 1° A F O'-58 19' d 127 s t 527 126 76' 509
- 2711 *ἀπηλώτην* B M^{ms} 767 56^{txt} n 392 55] pr *προς βορραν* f-56^{txt}; -τη 19'; *αφηλ.* 707 527;
νοτον 29; *βορραν* (cvar) rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 289 *ἐν]* *ἐπ* A M O''-82 C'' d 127 s t 121' 18 46 424 426 509 Aeth^C Arab Syh
- 2812 *τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ]* *αὐτων* 707-767 n 527 Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth^C Arab Syh^{LxtT}
- 2916 *αὐτόν* B 82 f n 71' 392 55 426 799 Bo] *τον* (> 527) *κρινον* rell
- 2921 *ἀπό* 2°] *ἐπι* F^a M^{ms} 29 77 44 n t-134 71-619^c 46 59 426 509 646 Arab Arm Bo Syh
- 2938 *ἐπὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον* A^c B 15'-376 131^c 56'-129 71' 128'-628 55 319 799] *ἐπι του*
θυσιαστηριου 72; sub ÷ Syh; > rell
- 303 *αὐτά* A B oII 129 127 71'-527(2°) γ-318 46 55 319 426 Lat^{cod} 100 Arm^{te}] *αυτον* 509; *αυτο*
(aut -τω) rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 309 *ἀνοίσεις* B^c 15' 129 799] -σει B* 53'-56 55; -σετε (aut -σεται) rell
- 309 *σπείσεις* (cvar) B 15' 129] *ποιησεις* 55; *σπειρετε* b-537^c; *σποιησεται* 75; *ποιησετε* 59;
-σετε (cvar) rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3032 *ποιήσεται]* -σετε F^b M O'-376-29 118-537 s-30' t x y 68'-128'-407-628 18 46 59 verss
- 3037 *ποιήσεται]* -σετε F^b M 29-58-72^c-oI C''-52' 54 313' 550* 739* b d-44 127 s t x y 68'-407-128'
18 46 59 646 verss
- 3111 om *ἐγώ* O-15-707-707^I b f n 527 55 426 799 Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth Arm Syh
- 3113 *σύνταξον]* *λαλησον* M^{ms} 960 O-376-29'-707^I C''(-54) b d f-129 n(-458) 30'-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-
321'^{txt}-343-344^{txt} t 527 318' 46 424 509 799 Lat^{cod} 100 Arab Arm Bo Syh
- 3114 *αὐτοῦ* B 15' 55 426 Syh^L] > 509; *αυτης* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3115 *τῇ ἐβδόμῃ* 2°] *του σαββατου* A F^b O-767-29-64'-707^I 44' t 527 121' 18 46 319 509 Lat^{cod}
104 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
- 324 *αὐτά* 1°] *αυτο* (*αυτω* 126 59) A F M 376-oI'-707 C''-16 d 56' s-130° t 527 121 126-128'-
628 18 46 59 319 509 799 Aeth Arab Arm Bo^B Syh
- 324 *αὐτά* 2° B F^b 16-131*(vid) n-127 71' 55 426 646] *αυτω* 72 19 318; *αυτων* 767* 319; *αυτον*
707 108 129 127 126*; *αυτοις* 767^c 53'; > Arm; *αυτο* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3214 *τὸν λαόν* A B F 64'-oII-82 b 56' 30'-85^{ms}-130^{ms}-321'^{ms} 527 γ-318 46 55 509] pr *προς* 82
129 426; *τω λαω* rell
- 3227 *λέγει* 1° B M' O-15' 129 n 71' 68'-120' 18 55 426 646] *ειπεν* rell
- 3229 ἢ B 15-767 73'-550' b n 392 Lat^{codd} 100 103 104] > F^a; *και* rell
Syh wrongly has the *και* (instead of the next word?) sub ast.
- 3315 *λέγει* B F^b O-15' 73'-550' b 129 n 126-128'-407-628] *ειπεν* rell
- 341 *ἐν]* *ἐπι* A F 29'-72-376 C''-413 b d n s t x y 68' 46 59 319 509 Arab Co Syh
- 347 om *καὶ* 2° O n
- 3430 *πρεσβύτεροι* B M'^{ms} 15' f 344^{ms} 318 120' 55 Sa] *υιοι* rell
- 3535 *συνιέναι]* sub ÷ (※ τ) Syh; > 58-707 n 426 Lat^{codd} 100 103 Arab
- 3615 *ἐποίησαν]* -σεν A F^b M^{txt} O'(-618^{txt})-29 d 30' t 527 121' 126-128'-628 18 46 319 416 509
Aeth Arab Arm
- 3626 om *καὶ* 1° 707 d n t Lat^{cod} 100
- 375 *ἐποίησαν]* -σεν F^b G*-29-72 d 84-134 426 Arm Syh
- 377 idem] -σεν F^b 767 d t 799 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh
- 3718 om *καὶ* 1° — *ἀγγυρίω* F^b F^b O-381' C-52'-761 19' d 53' n-127 321 84 71' 68'-120'-
126-128 319 426 509 Aeth-F^{HR} Arab Arm Syh

37¹⁹ om καί F^a F^b 707 19' n 527 426 ^{Lat}codd 100 104 Arab Bo^B
 39⁶ τῶν στύλων] τοῖς στύλοις (cvar) B O²⁻²⁹ C¹¹ 19' 129 n 85^{txt}-130^{mg}-321^{mg}-343' 71' 55 426^c
 Aeth^C Arab Arm
 40²⁸ δόξης — fin] ἡ δοξα (+ του 414') $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ ἐπλησεν την σκηνην (+ του μαρτυριου 422) C¹¹ 19'
 d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ n 30'-85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343' t 646

In the summary statement at the end of Chapter I I stated that the large amount of support for non-hex revisions towards $\mathfrak{M}$ by members of the O group as well as by the oldest (uncial) mss seemed to indicate early preOrigen recensional activity.

Whether or not the Byzantine text was responsible for any of the possible non-hex recensional activity represented in the above list is not immediately obvious. If popular readings include support by O mss and/or one or more of the old uncials B A and F, there remains the likelihood that early preOrigenian revision is there represented. If one divide the above list into the two categories of those in which at least one O ms and/or one old uncial ms support a reading and of those which are not thus supported, the former will be found to contain 89 instances (of which, however, 11 have only one O ms or uncial witness), and the latter with 17.

Of the 17 which have no O ms or old uncial support, eight (6²⁶ 10^{14 25} 22^{10 20} 23²¹(2°) 25³⁷ 37¹⁹) are supported only by *n* or part of *n* from the Byzantine groups, and two (7²⁰ 9²⁴) only by *d* or part of *d*. This leaves only seven which are clearly Byzantine, i. e. are supported by at least two of the three Byzantine text groups (2¹⁸ 3¹⁶ 4⁵ 8¹⁵ 29²¹ 36²⁶ 40²⁸).

Possibly those with only one O ms or uncial included in the support for a reading might be considered to be an original Byzantine reading. Out of the *d n t* group 4⁷ is only supported by *n*⁻⁶²⁸, 23²⁵(1°) by *n*, 24⁶ by 107'-125 458 and 84, 28¹² by *n* (as well as by Aeth^C Arab Syh which are O witnesses), and 35³⁵ by *n*, whereas 37⁷ with *d t* support is also supported by F^b Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh, all excellent witnesses to O. On the other hand, 8²⁸ 9²(2°) 10¹⁰ 16²⁹ and 22²⁵ may well be original Byzantine readings.

Along with these 12 cases, the eight plusses referred to in the discussion at the end of List 1 above might also be considered as possibly originating in the Byzantine tradition. A total of 20 cases hardly constitutes a basis for positing the Byzantine text as a recension.

B. It would be much more appropriate now to analyse the nature of the Byzantine text for its own sake. In the list below are given instances of Byzantine readings which do not equal $\mathfrak{M}$; these readings are readings in which the mss of *d n t* constitute a majority of the Greek ms witnesses to a reading. Only instances are given in which the support from *d n t* is at least three mss. Excluded, however, are all instances in which the added support would be by another text group (defined herein as including a majority of the mss of a group). As in the preceding list patristic support is not given.

- 14 *Νεφθαλί*] -λιμ 56 t^{-46} 128' Latcod 100 Arm Bo
 111 *Πιθώμ*] *φιθωθ* F^a d^{-125} t^{-46}
 114 *κατωδύνων*] -νουν (-νου 107') d t 76
 114 *ὄν*] *εν οἷς* 58 d n^{-628} t Latcod 100 Syh
 119 *πρός*] *εις* 414' 107'-125
 28 *om* *αὐτῇ* — *Φαραώ* 107'-125
 215 *ἀνελεῖν*] + *αὐτον* 107' 458 t
 215 *ἐκάθισεν*] *εκαθητο* n
 219 *ἐπότισεν*] -*σαμεν* 72 107'-125 59
 220 *om* *ταῖς θυγατράσιν αὐτοῦ* 126 107'-125
 222 *εἰμι*] *pr* *εγω* 107'-125 619
 224 *ὁ θεός* 1°] *post* *αὐτῶν* *tr* n
 224 *τὸν στεναγμόν*] *του στεναγμου* n
 38 *ἐξελέσθαι*] *pr* *του* F d n 30' t
 38 *εἰσαγαγεῖν*] *συναγαγειν* 107'-125
 38 *Εὐαίων*] *εβαιων* 44'-610 59
 312 *ἀποστέλλω*] -*στελω* d 30-344* 121 59* Sa³
 315 *om* *θεός* 3° 107'-125
 315 *om* *θεός* 4° d^{-106} 619
 315 *om* *θεός* 5° d^{-106} 619 Latcod 100
 317 *ἀναβιβάσω*] -*βιβω* n
 317 *om* *καί* 3° 4° 5° 6° 44'-125 799
 318 *βασιλέα*] *pr* *τον* d n t
 319 *om* *βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου* 44'-125
 320 *ἐν* 2°] *μετ* 107'-125
 321 *χάριν* — *τούτῳ*] *τουτο* (-τω 44) d^{-44mg} t^{-46}
 42 *om* *τό* F^{c1}(vid) 426 d^{-44} 129 n^{-458} t Latcod 100
 46 *τὴν* 2° — *αὐτοῦ* 1°] *αὐτην* *και* *ειπεν* *ἐξενεγκε* *αὐτην* *απο* *του* *κολπου* *σου* 107'-125
 47 *πάλιν* 1°] *post* *εἰσένεγκε* *tr* d^{-44} 370 Latcod 100
 47 *τὴν χειρὰ* σου] *αὐτην* 107'-125
 47 *σου* 1°] $\cap$ 2° 107'-125 18
 47 *om* *τὴν* 2° — *αὐτοῦ* 1° 107'-125
 47 *αὐτήν*] *ταυτην* 107'-125
 47 *om* *ἐκ τοῦ κόλπου αὐτοῦ* 72-618 107'-125
 48 *σοι* 1°] *μοι* 106-107'
 49 *σοι*] σου d^{-44} 370
 49 *δυσίν*] *δυο* 107'-125
 417 *ἐν τῇ χειρὶ*] *εις* *την* *χειρα* n
 418 *Μωσῆ*] *τω* *μωση* 426 126 n
 419 *Μωσῆν*] *μωσην* 135-426 126 44*-107' n
 421 *ἀποστρέφοντος*] -*στραφεντος* d
 421 *om* *αὐτά* 707^{xt} 107'-125 246 Arm Sa
 423 *εἶπα*] *ειπον* n
 423 *ἀποκτενῶ*] -*κτεινω* d^{-106} t 527 55* 509 Syh
 427 *καὶ συνήντησεν*] *εις* *συναντησιν* d $t^{(-46)}$ Sa
 427 *αὐτῷ*] *αυτου* d^{-107}
 430 *πρός* *Μωσῆν*] *τω* *μωση* n
 430 *ἐποίησεν*] -*σαν* 426 n 527
 55 *καταπαύσωμεν*] -*σομαι* d 458
 58 *πορευθῶμεν καί*] *πορευθεντες* d 370
 511 *ἐαυτοῖς ἄχυρα*] *tr* n 30' Co
 514 *τοῦ* 2°] *τω* d^{-44}
 514 *πλινθείας*] *πλινθουργιας* d t 527
 516 *οἰκέταις* σου] *σοις* *οικεταις* 135 107' 458 t
 517 *σχολασταί*] *bis* *scr* d^{-106} t

522 κύριε] post ἐκάκωσας tr n
523 εἰσπεπόρευμαι] πορευομαι 107'-125
61 ἐκ] απο n
64 om init — αὐτοῖς d: homoiot
64 δοῦναι] + με 29 t
64 παρρηκασιν] pr αυτοι d⁻¹²⁵ t
67 ἐμαντῶ — ἐμοί] υμᾶς εἰς λαον ἐμαντῶ 29 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ t 509
68 ἐν κλήρῳ] εν καιρω t; > d⁻¹⁰⁶
69 Μωυσῆς] μωσης 72-135-426 126 107'-125 n
613 αὐτοῖς] + πορευεσθαι d t Co
613 τοὺς — fin] τον λαον αυτου 107'-125
614 Φαλλούς] φαλες 107'-125
618 Χεβρών] χευρων d^{-106c}
619 οἴκοι πατριῶν] εκ πατριας 707 n Lat^{cod} 100
619 οἴκοι] οικου t^{-370c}
620 om τε 126 n 799
623 ἀδελφὴν] + δε 426 44 n t 646
623 Ἐλεάζαρ] et Ἰθαμάρ tr d
625 αὐτῷ 1°] αυτην 44-107'
625 om αἰ 426 552 d⁻⁶¹⁰ 53' 75 t
629 λέγω — fin] προς σε εντελλομαι 107'-125
630 καὶ πῶς] πως ουν 707 n
71 Φαραώ] pr τω d n t
72 σοι] pr εγω d 628 t; + εγω n⁻⁶²⁸
72 Φαραώ 1°] ∩ (3) 107'-125
75 ἐπ' Αἴγυπτον] επι την (> 707) γην αιγυπτου 707 n⁽⁻⁶²⁸⁾; επ αυτους d
710 om οὕτως 44-125' Lat^{cod} 100
716 μοι] με 107'-125 799
719 om σου 2° d 127-628 t Arm Sa
719 συνησθηκός] συστηκως d; συστηκος 74-84-370
719 ἐγένετο] γενησεται F^b d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ n 74-84-370 Co
720 om ἐναντίον 1° — αὐτοῦ 2° d 370
720 μετέβαλεν] -βληθη d
720 om πᾶν — ποταμῷ 2° d
721 Αἴγυπτου] -πτω F 707 d t 392
84 σέ] συ (pro σοι) d⁻¹⁰⁶
86 καὶ 3°] ∩ 4° d t⁻⁴⁶ 799 Bo^A Sa
86 ἐκάλυψεν] -ψαν 761 d t
88 om πρὸς d t
813 οἰκιῶν] οικων d 75' t
817 Ἀαρών / τῇ χειρὶ] tr d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ 370
818 τετράποσιν] + (cvar) και εν παντι χωματι της γης εγενοντο οι σκνιφες B^{mg} 107' n⁻⁷⁵ 30'
t 55
821 σου 1°] + και επι (> 125) πασαν γην αιγυπτου d n t 18 55
821 εἰς] επι M^{mg} 64^{mg} d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ n 85'^{mg}-343-344^{mg} t 318'
821 αὐτῆς] αυτην n
822 ἧς 1°] ην n 59
822 om ἔπεστιν 618 d t
823 om ἀνὰ μέσον 2° 44'-125 646 Arab
823 om λαοῦ 2° 44'-125 53'
824 om εἰς τοὺς οἴκους 2° 126 44'-125
826 λιθοβοληθησόμεθα] -λησωμεθα (cvar) 19 d⁻¹⁰⁶ 246 75 343
829 om ἀπὸ 3° d Arab
829 θῦσαι] οπως θυσωσιν (cvar) d n t
97 ἰδών] ειδεν n
910 om ἐν 2° d
913 Μωυσῆν] μωσην 426 n 130

- 920 $\delta]$ + $\delta\epsilon$ d 53' 370^{Lat}cod 104 Aeth Bo^B Pal Sa
 923 $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu]$ $\delta\iota\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon$ 107'-125
 926 $\gamma\eta]$ $t\eta$ d (-44) t -134
 929 $t\eta\nu$ $\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\lambda\iota\nu]$ $t\eta$ $\acute{\rho}\acute{o}\lambda\epsilon\iota$ 107'-125 458
 931 $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho]$ $\delta\epsilon$ 106-107' 130^{txt} Aeth
 101 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\epsilon]$ + $\lambda\alpha\lambda\eta\sigma\omicron\nu$ d 246 n 85' t 18 130
 102 $\acute{\omicron}\pi\omega\varsigma]$ + $\alpha\nu$ 15 d t
 102 $\gamma\nu\acute{\omega}\sigma\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon]$ - $\sigma\eta\sigma\theta\epsilon$ 106-125' t -84
 103 $\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\omega\sigma\acute{\iota}\nu]$ $\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\nu\sigma\eta$ (- $\sigma\epsilon\iota$ 75-628) 246 n -458^{Lat}cod 104
 108 $\Phi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}\omega]$ $\tau\omicron\nu$ $\lambda\alpha\omicron\nu$ 107'-125
 108 $\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon]$ $\lambda\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\nu\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ 29' d 246 127' 85' 46-74-370 392 130 509
 109 $\theta\upsilon\gamma\alpha\tau\rho\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota\nu]$ $\rho\acute{\rho}$ $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ ($\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$ 44-107 46) 29-72 d -125 t 318 55 59 76' 509
 1012 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}$ $t\eta\nu$ $\gamma\eta\nu]$ $\epsilon\pi$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu$ d
 1014 $\gamma\eta\nu]$ $\rho\acute{\rho}$ $t\eta\nu$ 72 126 44'-107 53' t 799
 1021 $\gamma\eta\nu]$ $\rho\acute{\rho}$ $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ n -75 t 318 18; $\rho\acute{\rho}$ $\pi\alpha\sigma\alpha\nu$ $t\eta\nu$ d 246 75 Aeth^{CG}
 1023 $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ 2°] $\omicron\upsilon\theta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ 29 d -610 129 t 392-527 120
 113 $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\rho\eta\sigma\alpha\nu]$ $\epsilon\chi\rho\iota\sigma\alpha\nu$ d 75' 30
 113 $\omicron\mu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\alpha\nu\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ 126 d -125
 114 $\text{Μωυση}\varsigma]$ + $\tau\omega$ $\phi\alpha\rho\alpha\omega$ d 370^c Arab Bo^Ac^B
 119 $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\omega}\nu]$ $\upsilon\mu\alpha\varsigma$ 107'-125
 123 $\pi\rho\acute{o}\beta\alpha\tau\omicron\nu$ 1°] - $\tau\alpha$ d -44 628 t
 1214 $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\eta}\nu$ 1°] $\epsilon\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu$ 44-125'-610^c 53 799
 1218 $\acute{\alpha}\phi']$ $\alpha\pi\omicron$ n
 1222 $\theta\acute{\upsilon}\rho\alpha\nu$ 2°] + $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ $\omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon$ d n t 55 799 Aeth
 1224 $\phi\upsilon\lambda\acute{\alpha}\xi\epsilon\sigma\theta\epsilon]$ - $\xi\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ 106 n
 1227 $\text{Αἰγύπτῳ}]$ $\rho\acute{\rho}$ $\gamma\eta$ M d n t 121 68' 18 59 130 Aeth Arab
 1230 $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta]$ $\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma\tau\eta$ $\delta\epsilon$ n
 1231 $\omicron\mu$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ 5° d 53' n t 76' Co
 1233 $\acute{\eta}\mu\epsilon\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\theta\eta\acute{\nu}\sigma\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu]$ $\tau\omicron$ n
 1234 $\tau\acute{o}$ $\sigma\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma]$ (+ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ 610) $\tau\alpha\iota\varsigma$ $\sigma\tau\omicron\lambda\alpha\iota\varsigma$ 107'-125
 1239 $\acute{\eta}\delta\upsilon\nu\acute{\eta}\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu]$ $\epsilon\delta\upsilon\nu$. 44 127 t -84
 1240 $\acute{\eta}\nu]$ η d ^{Lat}cod 101
 1241 $\tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{o}\sigma\iota\alpha$ $\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$ $\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta]$ $\tau\omega\nu$ $\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 107'-125
 1242 $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{\eta}$ 1°] $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\phi\upsilon\lambda$. d
 1242 $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\upsilon\lambda\alpha\kappa\acute{\eta}$ 2°] + $\epsilon\sigma\tau\iota$ (ν) 426 d n t (-74) 318 ^{Lat}codd 101 104 Bo Sa^c
 1245 $\omicron\mu$ $\acute{\alpha}\pi'$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ d
 1247 $\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\gamma\omega\gamma\acute{\eta}]$ $\rho\acute{\rho}$ η n -628 85'
 1248 $\pi\rho\acute{o}\varsigma$ $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\alpha}\varsigma]$ $\upsilon\mu\iota\nu$ M 29 d t 392 18 509 799
 1249 $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\iota$ $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\tau\omega]$ $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\eta\lambda$. $\tau\omega$ $\pi\rho\omicron\epsilon\lambda\theta\omicron\nu\tau\iota$ 44'-125
 1250 $\text{Μωυση}\acute{\eta}]$ $\mu\omega\sigma\eta$ 426 n -628
 131 $\text{Μωυση}\acute{\nu}]$ $\mu\omega\sigma\eta\nu$ 72-426 126 107 n
 135 $\omicron\mu$ $\sigma\epsilon$ d
 135 $\omicron\mu$ $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ 2° 3° 44'-125
 135 $\text{Ευαίων} — \text{Ἰεβουσαίων}]$ (cvar) $\alpha\mu\omicron\rho\rho\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (> 44'-125) $\phi\epsilon\rho\epsilon\zeta$. $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (> 44'-125) $\iota\epsilon\beta\omicron\upsilon\sigma$.
 $\kappa\alpha\iota$ (> 44'-125) $\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\omega\nu$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\gamma\epsilon\rho\gamma\epsilon\sigma$. 29 d t 509 Bo
 137 $\acute{\omicron}\rho\acute{\iota}\omicron\iota\varsigma]$ $\nu\iota\omicron\iota\varsigma$ d -44
 1312 $\sigma\omicron\iota]$ $\sigma\omicron\upsilon$ d -125
 1318 $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa$ $\gamma\acute{\eta}\varsigma]$ $\epsilon\zeta$ A 707 n
 1319 $\text{Μωυση}\varsigma]$ $\mu\omega\sigma\eta\varsigma$ 72-135-426 313* 107' n
 146 $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon]$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ F 458 321^{ms}(vid) t 392 630
 1410 $\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\beta\acute{\omicron}\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ $\delta\acute{\epsilon}]$ $\kappa\alpha\iota$ $\alpha\nu\epsilon\beta$. 414' 106 n Bo^A
 1413 $\text{Μωυση}\varsigma]$ $\mu\omega\sigma\eta\varsigma$ 15-72-135-426 552 107'-125 n
 1413 $\omicron\mu$ $\acute{\upsilon}\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ 107'-125 59 Bo^B
 1415 $\text{Μωυση}\acute{\nu}]$ $\mu\omega\sigma\eta\nu$ 15-72-426 107'-125 n 619
 1420 $\epsilon\acute{\iota}\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\nu]$ - $\theta\omicron\nu$ 29 d -125 t
 1425 $\omicron\mu$ $\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$ $\text{Αἰγυπτίους}]$ d -44 Aeth Arab
 1426 $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\tau\omega]$ - $\sigma\eta\tau\omega$ 314 106-125'

- 1427 *χώρας*] -ραν 53' *t*
 151 *om καί 1°* — *Ἰσραήλ* A* 15 107'-125
 1514 *κατοικοῦντας*] *παντες οι κατοικουντες* 44'-107 53 ^{LatCantMil}
 1520 *ἐν*] *pr το* 107'-125
 161 *Αἰλίμ 2°*] *ελίμ* 107'-125 Bo
 162 *διεγόγγυζεν*] -ζον 15-426 *d*^{-125c} *t*⁻⁸⁴ Syh
 163 *om πρὸς αὐτοὺς* 44-107' *t*
 163 *ὅταν ἐκαθίσαμεν*] *οτε (οτι 44' 458) εκαθημεθα d n t* Aeth Arm Pal Syh
 163 *τῶν 2°*] *pr και* 107'-125
 168 *κρέα*] *post φαγεῖν tr d*
 168 *ἄρτους*] *αρτον F^b d*
 168 *διαγογγύετε*] *διεγ. d* (-125) 85 84^c
 169 *ἐναντίον*] *εναντι d; ενωπιον n* 646
 169 *om γάρ* 44-107'
 1610 *om init* — *ἐρημον* 44-107'
 1614 *λεπτόν*] *λευκη d*
 1614 *κόριον*] *εριον d*
 1615 *ἦν*] *εστιν d* (-44) *t* Arm Co
 1615 *om ó d t*
 1616 *κατά 2°*] *pr και d* (-610) 53' *n*⁻⁷⁵ *t*⁻⁸⁴ 130
 1618 *οὐκ ἐπλεόνασεν*] *post πολύ tr n* 318 799 Arm
 1621 *ἐτήκετο*] *επικετο d*
 1622 *πάντες*] *post συναγωγῆς n* Aeth^R
 1622 *Μωυσῆ*] *μωση* 15-58 *n*
 1623 *om ἔψετε d* 59
 1623 *om καί 2° d*
 1624 *αὐτῶ*] *αυτοις B* 72 73-413 *d*⁻⁴⁴ *t*
 1628 *Μωυσῆν*] *μωσην* 15-58-426 126 107' *n*
 1629 *ἐκπορευέσθω*] *εκπορευετω* 313* 107'-125 619
 1631 *ἐπινόμασαν*] + *αυτου* 107'-125
 1631 *ἦν*] *μαγον (μεγ 106) d*⁻⁴⁴
 1633 *Μωυσῆς*] *ἄς d t*
 1634 *καί*] *pr (cvar) ελαβεν δε ααρων την σταμνον και ενεβαλεν εις αυτην εκ του μαν πληρης το γομορ* 82^{mg} *d*
 171 *τῆς*] *γης d t*
 172 *Μωυσῆς*] *μωσης* 15-58-426 125 *n*
 173 *ὁ λαός 2°*] + *εκει* 44-107' *t* Pal Sa⁹
 175 *Μωυσῆν*] *μωσην* 15-58-426 126 106-107' *n*⁻⁴⁵⁸ 71
 176 *ἐγώ*] *καγω* 107'-125
 177 *κύριος* / *ἐν ἡμῖν*] *tr* 19' *n* Arm
 1710 *Μωυσῆς 2°*] *pr εξελθων* 107'-125
 1710 *fin*] + *και ιησους παρεταξατο τω αμαληκ καθα συνεταξεν αυτω μωσης* 107'-125
 1714 *βιβλίῳ*] -λω 15-58 552-761* *d n*⁻¹²⁷ *t* 59
 181 *Ἰσραήλ 1°*] *pr τω* 16-54-414' 44 *n* (-458) *t*
 181 *ἐξήγαγεν γάρ*] *ως (οπως 53') εξ. F^a 126 d* 53' *n* (-458) *t* 128-628 55 Bo
 182 *om Ἰοθόρ* — *Μωυσῆ 1° d*⁻⁴⁴ ^{Latcod} 104
 183 *om ὄνομα* — *αὐτῶν d*⁻⁴⁴
 183 *λέγων* — (4) *fin*] *και ελιεζερ d*⁻⁴⁴
 185 *Ἰοθόρ* — *Μωυσῆν*] *προς μωση μετ αυτων* 107'-125
 187 *om τῷ γαμβρῷ* 72 *d*⁻¹⁰⁶
 189 *om ὅτι* — *fin* 126 19 44'-125
 1810 *χειρός 1°*] *∩ 2°* 16 107'-125 628
 1813 *Μωυσῆ*] *μωση* 15*-58 *n*
 1814 *παρέστηκέν*] *παρειστηκει (cvar) d n*⁻¹²⁷ 527
 1815 *om τῷ γαμβρῷ d*⁻⁴⁴
 1815 *με*] *εμε* 44-107' *t*
 1818 *ἀνυπομονήτω*] *ανυπονοητω A^c d*⁻¹⁰⁶ *t*⁻¹³⁴ 392 55

- 1821 *ἄνδρας δυνατοὺς θεοσεβεῖς*] post *ὑπερῆφανίαν* tr (om *ἄνδρας* 106-125) *d*
 1821 *μισοῦντας*] pr *καὶ d* (-125) *n*⁻⁷⁵ *t* 76
 1821 *χιλιάρχους*] -*χας* 106-107'
 1825 *ἐπέλεξεν*] *ἐξελ.* 107'-125
 191 *τοῦ 3°*] *την* 130^{ms}-321^{ms} *n*
 199 *λαλοῦντός μου*] tr 107'-125
 199 *σε 2°*] + *εν στυλῳ νεφελῆς d*
 1910 *λαῶ*] + *τουτω d* 57 56* *t*
 1912 *ἑαυτοῖς*] *υμιν αυτοις d t*
 1913 *ἄψεται*] *οψεται d*⁻¹⁰⁶
 1913 *ἐκεῖνοι*] *εκει d t*
 1915 *γίνεσθε*] *γεν. d*⁻¹²⁵ *t*⁻⁸⁴
 1916 *ὄρους*] *ορος 29 t* 55 509
 1916 *ὁ 2°*] *ος ην d* 56' *n t*
 1918 om *καπνός 2°* 107'-125
 1922 *ἀγιασθήτωσαν*] -*σονται* 107'-125 458
 1924 *κατάβηθι*] pr *και F* 29 *d t* Aeth^{-P}
 205 *λατρεύσης*] -*σεις 44 n*⁻¹²⁷
 209 *ἐργᾶ*] *εργαζου d*
 2011 *κύριος 1°*] + *ο θξ d*⁻¹²⁵ *n t* Arm Syh^{T*}(vid)
 2012 om *καί 2° d* (-125) *t* Aeth Bo^A
 2018 om *πᾶς ὁ λαός 2°* 107'-125
 2019 *Μωσῆν*] *μωσην* 15 551 *n*
 2021 *θεός*] + *εκει M*^{ms} 58 *d n t*
 2022 *Μωσῆν*] *μωσην* 15 126 *n*
 2023 *ποιήσετε 1°*] + *υμιν B* 707 *d t*
 2024 *γῆς*] pr *της* 107'-125
 2024 om *τά 3°* 107'-125
 2024 om *ἄν 73 d t* 319*
 2026 *ἐπ'*] *απ 44-107*-125-610* 59
 217 *ἀποδῶται*] -*δοτω* (cvar) *d*⁻⁶¹⁰ 458
 2113 *παρέδωκεν*] + *αυτον A F*^a 29-58 *d n*⁻⁷⁵ *t* Co
 2115 *θανατούσθω*] *τελευτατω 707 n*
 2116 init — (17) fin] post (19) fin tr *d* 370
 2119 *τῆς*] *τας 58 422-550' d*⁻⁶¹⁰ 370^s Sa
 2128 *ἔσται*] *εστω 106^{cpr m}-107'-125* 370
 2129 *πρὸ τῆς 2°*] om *πρὸ d*^{-44*} *t*⁻⁸⁴ 646 ^{Lat}cod 100; > 44* *n*⁻¹²⁷ 730 84
 2129 *τρίτης*] + *ημερας 58-707 d n t* 527 128 ^{Lat}cod 100
 2129 *ἀφανίσῃ*] *αποφαν. d*
 2130 *τῆς*] pr *αντι 58' n* ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm
 2131 *αὐτῷ*] *αυτον* 107'-125
 2134 *ἀργύριον*] pr *η d t* 55
 2136 om *καί 3°* 25 107'-125
 225 *αὐτοῦ 2°*] + *του d* 370
 228 *πεπονηρεῦσθαι*] -*ρενεσθαι 82 d*^{-107c} 246 30
 228 *παρακαταθήκης*] *παραθ. 58^{ms}-707-767 d n t*
 229 *οὖν*] + *τι 767 106-107' n t*
 229 *ἐλεύσεται*] *ἐξελ. n* Sa
 2211 *αὐτόν*] *εαυτον* 107'-125
 2211 *παρακαταθήκης*] *παραθ. 707-767 n*
 2214 *ἦ*] pr *η αιχμαλωτον* (cvar) *γενηται* (> 707) 707-767 *d n* 30' *t* 55 Syh^{LmsT}
 2226 *ἐνεχύρασμα*] -*χειρασμα* (-*σμου 44*) *d*⁻¹²⁵
 2228 *θεούς*] *θν d*^{-106^{sup} lin} *t* Sa
 2313 om *τοῦ 618*-767 n*
 2315 *ἐξῆλθε*] -*θετε 707-767 d n* 30' *t* 527 ^{Lat}cod 102 Aeth Arab Arm
 2318 *ἐκβάλω*] -*λλω d* 730
 2318 *θύσεις*] *θυσιασεις F* 29 *d*⁻⁴⁴ *t* 76'

- 23₂₁ εἰσάκουε] -κουσε 618 d⁻¹⁰⁶
 23₂₄ καθελεῖς] καθερεις d⁻¹⁰⁶
 23₂₇ οὕς] α n 392
 23₂₇ αὐτούς] αὐτα 767 n
 23₂₈ Χετταίους] + και τους (>44-125) ιεβουσαιους M 767 d t 46; + και τους φερεζαιους και τους γεργεσαιους και τους ιεβουσαιους 77 n 18
 23₃₃ οὐκ ἐγκαθήσονται] ου συγκαταθ. 29 d t 68' 424
 24₄ Μωυσῆς 1°] μωσης 15-72 551 107' n 527
 24₄ idem 2°] μωσης 15-72 78 107' n 527
 24₉ Μωυσῆς] μωσης 15-72 610 n 527
 24₁₂ Μωυσῆν] μωσην 15 107'-125 n
 25₁ Μωυσῆν] μωσην 15 n 126
 25₂ οἷς] ης d⁽⁻¹⁰⁶⁾
 25₁₁ ἐλάσεις] -σης d⁻¹⁰⁶ n⁻⁷⁵ 126
 25₁₃ αἰρειν] αιρουσιν (αιρεσ. 106) d⁻⁴⁴
 25₁₇ τορευτά] + ποιησεις αὐτα d⁻¹²⁵ n t
 25₁₈ ποιηθήσονται] -σεται 767 d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ n t Aeth
 25₁₉ τῶν] + δυο 767 d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ n⁽⁻⁷⁵⁾ t
 25₂₀ om ἃ 73* d⁻¹⁰⁶ 75* 30
 25₂₁ σοι 3°] + λαλησεις 82 d 628
 25₂₂ πήχεων] πηχων F d⁻¹⁰⁶ t 55 59 509
 25₂₃ om στρεπτά — (24) ποιήσεις 107'-125
 25₂₆ δακτύλιοι] -λοι 58' 25* d 664 130 t 120' 76
 25₂₈ θύσικας] + και (> 125) τας φιαλας (aut φναλ.) M 767 d n t 527 18 46 Latcodd 95 96 100 102 et T: 91 94
 25₃₁ πλαγίων] pr των 767 d n t
 25₃₁ αὐτῆς] post ενός tr 29 d t 68' 509
 25₃₂ ἐν] pr οι σφαιρωτηρες (cvar) 767 d⁻⁴⁴ n^{-127c} t
 25₃₃ καρύσκους] -σκοι 106-125' 370c 527; + (+ οι σφερωτηρες 106) εν τω (> A 106 75) καλα-μίσκω τω ενι A M 767 106-125' n t 18 46
 25₃₆ σφαιρωτήρες] + και τα (> 767*) κρινα M 707-767 d n t 527 18 46 Latcod 102
 26₁ καί 4°] καν 107'-125
 26₅ μέρους] pr ενος 707-767 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ n t 527 Aeth
 26₆ κρίκους] δακτυλιους M^{mg} n
 26₆ κρίκοις] δακτυλιοις 767 n
 26₈ δέρρεως 1°] δερρης d⁻¹⁰⁶
 26₁₁ ἔσται] εσονται A M^{mg} 767 d n t Arm Bo^B
 26₁₄ κατακάλυμμα] το καλυμμα 107'-125
 26₁₄ ἡρυθροδανωμένα] ερυθρ. 58' d
 26₁₄ δέρματα 2°] -τινα κριων d t
 26₁₉ ἐνί 2°] ετερω 107'-125
 26₂₄ γωνίαις] + και 58-767 d n t
 26₂₆ πέντε] + μοχλους M 707-767 19' d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t 527 18 46 Latcod 102 Arm Sa
 26₂₇ στύλῳ 1°] + τω ενι 58-707c-767 19' d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t 318 76' 799 Latcod 102 Arm Pal
 26₂₈ ἀνά] pr ο 106-107' n t
 26₃₃ ἐπί] υπο 707 n
 26₃₅ μέρους 2°] το μερος 767 n
 26₃₇ πέντε στύλους] tr n 126
 27₇ αὐτό] αὐτω 767 d^{-610*} 46* 55*
 27₈ παραδειχθέν] -δηλωθεν d
 27₉ πρὸς] κατα 707-767 d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t 527
 27₉ λίβα] βορ(ρ)αν M^{mg} 707-767 19' d^{-106c} n t 527
 27₁₀ κρίκοι] δακτυλιοι (aut -λοι) 767 n
 27₁₁ om εἴκοσι 2° d⁻⁴⁴
 27₁₁ οἱ κρίκοι] αι κρικαι d⁻⁴⁴; οι δακτυλιοι (aut -λοι) 767 44 n
 27₁₁ αἱ 3°] + πασαι 58 d⁻⁴⁴ 127 t⁻⁸⁴
 27₁₁ fin] + (cvar) και ουτω το προς νοτον ιστια εκατον πηχεων το μηκος και οι στυλοι αυτων

- εικοσι και αι βασεις αυτων εικοσι χαλκαι και οι δακτυλοι και αι ψαλιδες των στυλων και αι
 βασεις αυτων περιηγυρωμεναι αργυριω 767 107'-125 n t 18
 27¹² δέκα 1°] ∩ 2° d n⁻¹²⁷
 27¹⁴ πέντε και δέκα] δεκα πεντε d 458 30' 126
 27¹⁸ εκατόν 2°] + (+ πη ρ 75*) πηχεων n
 27²¹ αὐτοῦ] αυτων d 370
 28⁶ κεκλωσμένης] -νου 107'-125
 28⁷ ἐξηρημέναι] -τισμενοι (cvar) d⁻⁴⁴
 28¹⁰ ὀνόματα 1°] -ματι 106*-107'-125*
 28¹⁴ ἔργον] εργων 376 d 130 370 527
 28¹⁵ αὐτό] ∩ (16) 107'-125
 28²⁰ περικεκαλυμμένα] -κεκλωσμενα (cvar) 707-767 d n t 509
 28²¹ om τά d⁻⁴⁴ 74-370
 28²¹ om κατά 2° — ἔστωσαν 2° 107'-125
 [28²⁶] καί 1°] ∩ [27] 1° 107'-125
 [28²⁷] συμβολήν] -βουλην d⁽⁻¹⁰⁶⁾ 458 130
 28³³ om κατά — fin 72 d⁻⁴⁴ 509
 28³⁸ μηρῶν] pr των 707 d n t
 28³⁹ προσπορεύονται] προπορευονται d⁻⁴⁴ 799
 28³⁹ αὐτόν] αυτου d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t 18
 29¹ αὐτοῖς] pr επι του (το 707) θυσιαστηριου (-ριον 707) M^{ms} 707 n; + επι του θυσιαστηριου
 d t
 29¹ ἱερατεύειν μοι αὐτούς] αυτ. ιερ. εμοι n
 29⁵ πρὸς] και F 107'-125 129
 29⁷ om αὐτοῦ 107'-125
 29⁹ τάς 1°] τους 107'-125
 29⁹ om αὐτοῖς 2° d
 29⁹ om τὰς χεῖρας 2° 44'-125 Latcodd 91 94—96
 29¹³ ἐπ'] υπ d
 29¹³ om ἐπὶ 2° 107'-125
 29¹⁶ σφάξεις] -ξης 313 d 664
 29²⁰ idem] -ξης 19 d⁻⁶¹⁰ 664 527
 29²⁰ τῆς 1° — δεξιᾶς] et τοῦ 4° — δεξιου 2° tr d
 29²⁰ χειρὸς] + αυτου Fa d n t 318 509 Aeth Arm; + αυτων hex
 29²⁰ ποδὸς] + αυτου Fa 58 d 246 n t Aeth Arm; + αυτων hex
 29²² τὴν κοιλίαν] pr επι 107'-125
 29²² om τὸν 1° 107'-125
 29²⁴ om comma d⁻¹⁰⁶: homoiot
 29³⁰ om init — (33) αὐτῶν 1° 107'-125
 29³⁰ ἐπτά] pr τας n
 29³⁰ αὐτά] ταυτα 44' t
 29³⁷ καθαριεῖς] pr και 707 n Arm
 29³⁸ ἐνιαυσίους] post ἀμώμους tr 25* d t Bo
 29⁴⁰ δέκατον] δεκασον 107'-125
 29⁴⁰ τῷ τετάρτῳ] το (> n 71') τεταρτον F^b d⁻⁴⁴ 246 n t 71' Aeth
 29⁴⁰ om τοῦ ἱν 1° d^{-106c}
 29⁴² ὥστε λαλήσαί] οτε λαλησω 107'-125
 29⁴⁶ θεὸς εἶναι] ων θεος d t
 30⁴ αὐτῷ] + εν ταις δυσιν πλευραις d n t
 30⁴ κλίτῃ] pr αυτου d 127 t⁽⁻⁸⁴⁾
 30⁸ ἐνδελεχισμοῦ] post παντός tr 707 d 246 n t 527(2°)
 30¹¹ Μωσῆν] μωσην 761 107 n 130 426
 30¹³ διδράχμου 1°] δραχμου d⁻⁴⁴
 30¹³ ὃ 2° — δίδραχμον 2°] post (14) fin tr 107'-125
 30¹⁵ ἐλαττονήσει] -ττωσει 29 500 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ n t 46 509
 30¹⁵ κυρίῳ] + παρα των υιων ιηλ 58-707 d⁻¹²⁵ 129 n t 527 55 Arm
 30¹⁶ κυρίου] + μνημοσυνον γαρ εστιν 58-707 d⁻¹²⁵ n t 527

- 30₁₇ Μωυσην] μωσην *n*
 30₂₂ Μωυσην] μωσην 761 53* *n*
 30₂₈ om τὸ θυσιαστήριον 107'-125
 30₂₈ καὶ 2°] $\cap$ 3° 107'-125
 30₃₁ ἄγιον] + αγίων F^{b1} 767 *d n t* Lat^ccod 100
 30₃₃ ποιήση] -σεις 107'-125
 30₃₄ Μωυσην] μωσην 78-761 107'-125 *n*
 30₃₅ θυμίαμα] + μυρον 767 *d n*⁻⁷⁵ *t*
 30₃₅ ἔργον 1°] + αγιον συνθεσεως 767 *d* 127 *t*; $\cap$ 2° 75'
 30₃₅ μυρεψου] post μεμιγμένον *tr d t*
 30₃₇ ταύτην] ταυτης 107'-125
 30₃₇ ἔσται] εστιν 767 *n* Lat^ccod 100
 30₃₈ ἂν] εαν 58-767 *n*
 30₃₈ om ὥστε 767 *n*
 31₁ Μωυσην] μωσην 58 *n* 130
 31₂ Οὐρί] ορι *d*⁻¹²⁵
 31₂ υἱου] τον του 767 *n*
 31₂ τῆς] εκ 767 *n*
 31₄ βύσσον] βυσσιν (*cvar*) *d*
 31₆ om του *d t* 509
 31₁₂ Μωυσην] μωσην *n*
 31₁₃ om λέγων 413 *d*⁻⁴⁴ 75 126 Arab
 31₁₃ φυλάξεσθε] -ξατε 767 *n*⁻⁴⁵⁸; -ξειτε 458
 31₁₄ τουτο ἐστιν] *tr* F^b 29 *d* 56' *n*⁻¹²⁷ *t* 392 46(vid) 319 509 799 Arm
 31₁₄ om θανάτω *d t*
 31₁₅ ἡμέρα τῇ ἐβδόμῃ 1°] εβδ. ημ. 708 107'-125
 31₁₅ om πᾶς — *fin* 381' 107'-125
 31₁₈ Μωυση] μωση 58 *n*
 32₃ τά 1° — αὐτῶν] ταυτα 107'-125
 32₄ χωνευτόν] σιτευτον 107'-125
 32₆ ἐπαύριον] αυριον 707 *n* 527
 32₇ Μωυσην] μωσην 58 107'-125 *n*
 32₁₁ Μωυσης] μωσης 58 *n* 527
 32₁₂ om σου 2° *d t* 509
 32₁₄ κύριος] κε 72 *d*⁻¹⁰⁶ *n*⁻¹²⁷ 509
 32₁₈ ἐξαρχόντων 2°] $\cap$ 3° *d t*
 32₂₁ Μωυσης] μωσης 58' *n*
 32₂₁ om οὗτος *d* Arm
 32₂₂ Μωυσην] μωσην *n*
 32₂₉ Μωυσης] μωσης 58' 125 *n* 527
 32₃₂ ἔγραψας] -ψες *n*
 32₃₄ ἐπ' αὐτούς] επ (> 44') αυτω *d*
 33₅ ποιήσω σοι] ποιησεις M^{xt} *d t* 18 59 416
 33₇ ἔξω 1°] *pr* εμπροσθεν 767 127 *t*
 33₇ σκηνή] η (> 458) σκηνη σκηνη 58-707 *d n t* 527
 33₁₄ αὐτός] *pr* εγω M^{ms} 58-707-708^c-767 *d n t* 318 18 416 Arm
 33₁₅ om πρὸς αὐτόν 107'-125 53' Aeth^{FGH}
 33₁₇ Μωυσην] μωσην 58 107'-125 *n*
 33₁₈ λέγει] + μωσης (aut μωσης) 58-767 *d n t* 18 Aeth
 34₁ Μωυσην] μωσην 58 107'-125 *n*
 34₄ καθότι] καθαπερ 767 414* *n*
 34₄ Μωυσης 2°] μωσης 72 *n*
 34₅ κυρίου] κν F^a F^b 767 *d*⁻⁶¹⁰ 458 *t* Sa(vid)
 34₇ οὐ — ἔνοχον] καθαρισμω τον ενοχον ου καθαριει *d t*
 34₁₀ Μωυσην] μωσην *n*
 34₁₀ om σου 15-767 *d n t* Lat^ccodd 100 103 Sa
 34₁₁ πάντα] *pr* τα 707-767 *d n*⁻¹²⁷ *t* 527 426

- 3412 εἰς αὐτήν] εν αυτη d 129 t
 3417 σεαυτῷ] εαυτω 767 44' t^{-84*} 318
 3418 ἐντέταλμαί] ενετειλαμην 767 n
 3420 δώσεις] pr αυτου 767 n Aeth Arm Co
 3420 υἱῶν] τεκνων 767 n
 3421 καταπαύσεις 1°] αναπ. 767 n
 3425 σφάξεις] -ξη 58 107'-125
 3426 om σου εἰσοίσσεις 107'-125
 3427 Μωσῆν] μωσην 58 107'-125 n 424*
 3427 τέθειμαί] τιθημι d 53' t Arm^{ap}
 3429 Μωσῆς 1°] μωσης 58' n
 3429 Μωσῆ] μωση 58' n
 3429 αὐτῷ] τω θω 107'-125 Arab
 3431 om Ἀαρών — συναγωγῆς 107'-125
 3431 om Μωσῆς 2° 107'-125
 3434 Μωσῆς] μωσης B 58' 78 d⁻⁴⁴ n 527
 3434 ὅσα] pr παντα 707-767 d n t 527 121 55 Aeth Bo Syh
 3435 Μωσῆς] μωσης 58 107' n
 351 idem] μωσης 58' n
 359 om τῇ n
 3521 ἔφερεν] ηφ. d
 3523 παρ'] παντι d n t
 3524 ἀργύριον] pr χρυσιον (+ et Bo) 707 d⁻⁴⁴ n t 55 Latcod 103 Bo^A
 3524 om καὶ 2° 29 n 74-76 46 319 Latcod 103
 3524 ξύλα ἄσηπτα] tr 107'-125
 3527 σμαράγδου] σμαραγδιος d⁻⁴⁴
 3530 υἱοῦ] τον του n
 3532 om κατὰ — ἀρχιτεκτονίας d t
 362 om Μωσῆς τὸν 107'-125
 362 ᾧ] ο d
 362 ἐπιστήμην] συνεσιν επιστημης d 127 t
 363 om πρωί 2° B 72 d t 527 Latcod 100 Aeth^P Arab
 364 αὐτοῖ] αυτος d t^{-84txt}
 365 Μωσῆν] μωσην n 527
 366 Μωσῆς] μωσης B 72 n
 3611 ἄλληλα] -λας B^c 15 d t 55 59
 3611 συμπεπλεγμένον] -μενας d 55
 3611 καθ'] εις n
 3612 ἐποίησαν] εποιει d
 3612 Μωσῆ] μωση G n
 3613 τῆς] του 107'-125 76*
 3613 γεγλυμμένους] pr και 376-707 d n t 527 Latcod 100
 3613 σφραγίδος] + και οι λιθοι ησαν 707 19' d n t 527
 3613 ἐκ τῶν] εξ n 527
 3614 Μωσῆ] μωση G 25 n
 3621 ἐκ τῶν] εξ n
 3625 χρυσίου] + καθαρου 44'-107 n t 55
 3628 ἐποίησαν — χρυσοῦς] ετερονς δυο 107'-125
 3629 χαλᾶται] χολ. d⁻⁴⁴
 3630 ὑποδύτην] + υποδυτην (+ του 610) ποδηρη d⁻¹²⁵ 127^cpr^m-458 t⁻⁷⁶
 3631 δινφασμένον] -φασμον d
 3632 λώματος] αλωμ. 107'-125
 3632 ὥς] ωσει 707 d 129 n t
 3632 νενησμένον] διανεν. 82 500 d 509
 3638 χρυσίου] pr εκ 58 53 n Latcod 100 Aeth Arab Arm Syh
 3640 om ὃν — fin 107'-125 Aeth^{-C}
 3640 Μωσῆ] μωση n

372 *ὀκτὼ καὶ εἴκοσι*] $\overline{\kappa\eta}$ d^{-106} 458
 372 *πήχεων 2°*] *-χων* B 29-82 $d^{(-44)}$ 246* n^{-127} t 46 319 426 509
 374 *κατακεχρυσωμένους*] *κεχρυσ.* 107'-125
 376 *κρίκους*] *δακτυλιους* n
 3710 *αὐλαῖται*] *αυλαι* 15 d 55 59 416*
 3710 *om πήχεων* A^(c) d t
 3711 *τό 1° — ἀνατολάς*] *το προς ανατολας κλιτος* d t
 3711 *πέντε καὶ δέκα*] $\overline{\iota\epsilon}$ 107'-125 126
 3713 *πήχεων*] *πηχων* 15 d t 426 55 509
 3715 *om αἱ 2° 708* d 246 130-343 t^{-84}
 3716 *om καὶ τὸ ὕψος* d n t 392 319 426 509 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth^C Arab
 3719 *Μωυσῆ*] *μωση (-σης 72 458)* B 72 n
 3719 *τὴν λειτουργίαν / εἶναι*] *tr* n 30'
 3719 *εἶναι*] *ει* *και* d^{-106}
 3721 *ὕφαντά*] *et ῥαφιδευτά* *tr* n
 387 *χεροῦβ ἓνα 2°*] *ετερον* 72 d^{-106}
 389 *ἐποίησεν*] *-σαν* d t
 3816 *ἃ ἐστίν*] *αγια* d
 3816 *ἐνθέμια*] *ενθεσμια* $d^{(-106)}$ t
 3819 *κρίκους 1° 2°*] *δακτυλιους* n
 3819 *om τοὺς 2° — (20) ἐχώνουσεν* 107'-125
 3819 *κρίκους 3°*] *pr τους* 707* 106 246 t 319
 3820 *τῇ πύλῃ*] *της (τας n^{-127}) πυλης* F* 707 19' d n t 527 318 426 509
 3820 *οὗτος 2°*] *και* 107'-125
 3820 *αὐτοῦς*] *αυτα* 19' d 127 t
 3821 *om οὗτος ἐποίησεν* *et τοὺς πασσάλους 2°* d^{-106}
 3822 *om οὗτος ἐποίησεν* 107'-125
 3822 *τό 1°*] *pr και* d
 3824 *οὗτος ἐποίησεν*] *και* 107'-125
 3824 *τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ*] *το θυσιαστηριον* 376-767 d 53' t 426
 3827 *τόν*] *αυτον* d t 426
 394 *τῶν κεφαλίδων*] *της κεφαλιδος* 107'-125 59
 396 *om καὶ 4° 29* d 46
 398 *τῆς 1°*] *τας* 19' d^{-44} 426
 399 *om τοὺς πασσάλους 2°* d
 3911 *Μωυσῆ*] *μωση* n
 3912 *ἐναντι*] *-ντιον* 707 n
 3914 *τὰς βάσεις*] *et τοὺς μοχλοὺς* *tr* 29-708 d t 46 509
 3916 *τὰ σκεύη / αὐτοῦ*] *τα αυτου (+ τα 30) σκευη* n^{-127} 30; *tr* 127 730
 3917 *καύσεως*] *+ και το θυμιαμα της συνθεσεως* 107'-125
 3923 *Μωυσῆς 1°*] *μωσης* B 72 n
 401 *Μωσῆν*] *μωσην* 767 n 71
 403 *θήσεις*] *στησεις* 107'-125 122*
 403 *τῷ καταπετάσματι*] *του καταπετασματος* 107'-125
 409 *θυσιαστήριον 1°*] $\cap$ 2° F*(cpr^m) 1000(vid) 19' d t 426
 4015 *τῷ 3°*] *pr εν* d n t 527
 4019 *σκηνήν*] *+ του μαρτυριου* d n t
 4021 *om ὅν — fin* d ^{Lat}cod 104(vid)
 4021 *Μωυσῆ*] *μωση* G n
 4025 *συνθέσεως*] *συνεσεως* d^{-44}
 4029 *ἡδυνήθη*] *εδυν.* 376 $d^{(-125)}$ 127 74'

Not all of the instances in the long list above are necessarily Byzantine readings. There are 326 readings supported by only one text group: d 217; n 102 and t 7. The large number of readings for the d group is, however, misleading since 89 of these consist of 107'-125, of which 36 are cases of shorter text either by omission or com-

pression. The subgroup 107'-125 is generally speaking secondary within the *d* tradition and might well be disregarded in assessing the Byzantine text.

If one arbitrarily limit one's analysis (which I propose to do) to readings supported by more than one group, there remain 236 instances. Of these 92 are supported by members of all three groups. When only two groups support a variant text, *d* is lacking only three times, *t* 40 times, and *n* 96 times. The conclusion that *d* is the main group seems obvious, and that *n* is the most aberrant is also clear. When *n* goes its own way it is often in the direction of conservatism. Older, more classical forms are usually preferred by *n*; thus *εἶπα*, *εἶπαν*, *εἶποσαν* always occur as the classical *εἶπον* (cf. e.g. 423). The group may correct the anaphoric references as e.g. the change of *οὗς* to *α* and of *αὐτούς* to *αὐτα* (ἔθνη) in 2327. For some odd reason *n* prefers *δακτυλιοι* to *κρίκοι* (266bis 2710 11 376 3819bis). The name Moses is consistently spelled with the *μωσ*- stem rather than the original *μωυσ*- throughout. It appears then that *n* has undergone further revision of its Byzantine core text than the other two groups.

1. Analysis of the Byzantine text may involve change in nominal inflection. Change in case occurs at 3214 where the nom. *κύριος* becomes voc.; the gen. appears as dat. at 114 721, and as acc. at 345. On the other hand, the dat. becomes gen. at 3820, but acc. at 2940 3824, while the acc. is changed to nom. at 2533, to gen. at 2839, and to dat. in 929 277.

Change in number occurs at 123 1624 2721 from sing. to plur., and the reverse at 2228 and 364. Both number and case are involved at 2119 (of *τῆς* as *τας*) and 2814 (of *ἔργον* as *εργων*). Change in gender occurs at 3611 where *ἄλληλα* is changed to *αλληλας* to conform to *ἐπωμίδας*, at 3613 where *τῆς* (*σμαράγδου*) is changed to *του*, and at 3820 of *αὐτούς* to *αὐτα* for which cf Chap. VII, Sect. G 7. Declensional inflection is involved in the form *πηχων* for *πήχεων* at 2522 372 13.

The spelling of Moses is often involved in the (hebraizing?) use of the stem *μωσ*- rather than the old *μωυσ*- of Exod. In most cases some *d* mss join *n* in this practice. Only one other instance involving the spelling of a proper noun occurs, viz. at 111 of *φιθωθ* for *Πιθώμ*.

2. Verbal inflection also undergoes change in the Byzantine tradition. Tense is involved occasionally as the change from future to present at 423 shows, as well as present to aorist at 1915; present to imperfect at 168; of imperfect to present at 1615; aorist to future (719), to present (108 2318), and to pluperfect (1814), whereas the perfect becomes present at 3427. In this last case voice is also involved, i.e. passive to active. Preference for the active also obtains at 1224. Change in person occurs at 335 where the construction *ποιήσω σοι* is reworked as *ποιήσεις*. Number variation usually means change from sing. to plur. as at 86 1420 162 2315 2611 389, but once the change is the reverse (2518).

When modal change (along with change in tense) occurs in the variant tradition the change may at times be itacistic as in the change from indicative to subjunctive at

25¹¹ or the reverse at 20⁵. This is not the case at 10² (indicative to subjunctive), nor in the change to imperative at 21⁷⁻⁸. In one case the usual double augment *η-* for the aorist of *δύναμαι* occurs (40²⁹) with the single augment in *εδυνηθη*; cf also *ηφερεν* at 35²¹.

3. Change in preposition is rare in the tradition, only three instances obtaining. These are 8²¹ *εἰς* to *ἐπὶ*; 27⁹ *πρός* to *κατά*, and at 34¹² of *εἰς αὐτήν* to *ἐν αὐτῇ*. In one case, however, (40¹⁵) the preposition *ἐν* is added to introduce a dative construction.

4. Change in lexemes is common in the Byzantine text. Many are probably errors palaeographically inspired such as *γῆ* to *τῆ* (9²⁶) and *τῆς* to *γῆς* (17¹), or as dropping an *iota* from *οἰκίων* to *οικων* (8¹³), *βιβλίῳ* to *βιβλω* (17¹⁴), and *δακτύλιοι* to *δακτυλοι* (25²⁶), the addition of one grapheme in *συμβούλην* for *συμβολήν* at [28²⁷], *αλωματος* for *λώματος* (36³²) and *ενθεσμία* instead of *ἐνθέμία* (38¹⁶). At 11³ *εχρισαν* for *ἔχρησαν* is simply an itacism. Twice change of particle automatically involves change in word order as well. Thus a *δέ* to a *καί* construction (14¹⁰) and a *γάρ* to a *ὡς* phrase (18¹) involve change in word order as well.

On two occasions change in lexeme is accompanied by an explanatory gloss. At 19¹² *ἐαυτοῖς* becomes *ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς*, and at 26¹⁴ *δέρματα* 2° appears as *δερματινα κριων*. The remaining lexical changes occurring are simply listed with the text of Exod given in parentheses: 11⁴ *κατωδυνουν* (-δύνων), 51⁴ *πλινθουργίας* (*πλινθείας*), 10²³ *ουθεις* (*οὐδεῖς* 2°), 16³³ *κς* (*Μωσῆς*), 18¹⁸ *ανυπονοητω* (*ἀνυπομονήτῳ*), 19¹³ *ἐκει* (*ἐκεῖνοι*), 22⁸ *παραθηκης* (*παρακαταθήκης*), 23¹⁸ *θυσιασεις* (*θύσεις*), 23³³ *ου συγκαταθησονται* (*οὐκ ἐγκαθήσονται*), 27⁹ *βορ(ρ)αν* (*λίβα*), 28²⁰ *περικεκλωσμενα* (-*κεκαλυμμένα*), 29³⁰ *ταυτα* (*αὐτά*), 30¹⁵ *ελαττωσει* (*ἐλαττονήσει*), 34¹⁷ *εαυτω* (*σεαυτῷ*), 35²³ *παντι* (*παρ'*), 38²⁷ *αυτον* (*τόν*).

5. At times the variant tradition is more complex than the simple change of a single word. The prepositional phrase *πρός ὑμᾶς* becomes a simple *ὑμῖν* at 12⁴⁸, and a compound number *πέντε καὶ δέκα* is reordered at 27¹⁴ as *δεκα πεντε*. At 19¹⁶ the article *ὁ* is used as a relative pronoun which our text makes explicit by *ὡς ἦν*. More complex is the change of the clause *καὶ συνήνητησεν* to a prepositional phrase *εἰς συναντησιν* at 4²⁷. A simple infinitive *θῦσαι* (8²⁹) becomes a purposive clause in *ὡπως θυσωσιν*, and at 29⁴⁶ an infinitive construction *θεὸς εἶναι* is changed to a participial one in *ὡν θεός*, and at 16³ another temporal clause *ὅτε ἐκαθήμεθα* is substituted for the original *ὅταν ἐκαθίσαμεν*. The variant at 37¹¹ represents a change of the adjective phrase pattern: art. + n. + art. + adj. to that of art. + adj. + n.

6. A number of transpositions obtain in the Byzantine text. In no case has the change been made because of the Hebrew. These occur at 4⁷ 5¹⁶ 6⁷ 8¹⁷ 13⁵ 16¹⁸ 25³¹ 29³⁸ 30⁸⁻³⁵ 31¹⁴ 34⁷ and 39¹⁴.

7. Shortening of the text, so characteristic of the subgroup 107'-125 in the *d* group, also occurs in the fuller tradition at 3²¹ where *τουτο* serves to represent the original

χάριν τῷ λαῷ τούτῳ. More commonly, however, the shortening is done by straightforward omissions (31 cases). Most of these are of single words usually an article or a pronoun; in five cases parablepsis due to homoiot is involved (8₆ 27₁₂ 32₁₈ 37₁₆ 40₉), and in three instances (7₂₀ 16₃ 35₃₂) a prepositional phrase is omitted.

8. Far more frequent than a shortened text in the Byzantine tradition is the expanded text. This may simply be the repetition of a word as at 5₁₇ 33₇ 36₃₀ or of a syllable (του after αὐτοῦ in 22₅). At 10₂ the particle αν is added after ὅπως. Occasionally a conjunction is added as δε at 6₂₃, η at 21₃₄ and και at 16₁₆ 18₂₁ 19₂₄ 26₂₄ 36₁₃. The article is added to introduce a prepositional phrase after a noun at 26₂₈, before an infinitive at 3₈, before proper nouns at 7₁ 18₁ and other nominals at 10₉ 14₂₅ 28₃₁ 34₁₁ and 38₁₉.

Pronouns are added in the tradition: εγω as expressed subject at 7₂ 33₁₄; an acc. as expressed object at 21₁₃, as a doublet for Μωυσην at 2₁₅ and as subject of an infinitive at 6₄; an indefinite pronoun at 22₉; a gen. at 29₂₀ 30₄; a dat. at 20₂₃, and a demonstrative as attributive modifier at 19₁₀. An adverb of place obtains at 17₃ (εκει), 20₂₁ (εκει), and 33₇ (εμπροσθεν). A verb is added at 10₁ 12₄₂ and an infinitive at 6₁₃.

Nouns are occasionally added to render explicit what is already implicit as ημερας (21₂₉), μοχλους (26₂₆), and παντα (34₃₄). At 33₁₈ the subject of λέγει is made explicit by adding μω(υ)σης. A dative to indicate an indirect object occurs at 11₄, and gen. modifiers are added at 12₂₂ 26₁₄ 30₃₁ and 40₁₉. Modifiers in the same case are either appositional (12₂₇ 20₁₁ 30₃₅ 36₃₀) or attributive (10₂₁ 25₁₉ 26₅ 27₁₁ 36₂₅). A doublet appears at 36₂ where ἐπιστήμην is explained as συνεσιν επιστημης.

Longer additions are of various kinds. Prepositional phrases are added at 25₃₃ 29₁ 30₄ 15, and coordinate phrases at 8₂₁ 23₂₈ 25₂₈ 32₃₆ 35₂₄. And finally there are six instances in which full clauses have been added. These are at 8₁₈ 22₁₄ 25₁₇ 27₁₁ 30₁₆ 36₁₃.

In summary it may be stated that the Byzantine text is on the whole expansionist. It has been the object of a great deal of carelessness in the transmission, at times resulting in indefensible readings and even occasionally in readings which make little sense. The text has been considerably influenced by the hex recension, but it does not seem itself to have been independently recensional; at least this study has not uncovered evidence of conscious revision according to some recensional principles.

C. There remains one problem which must still be dealt with. What is the position of this text within the overall text history of Exodus? How does it relate to the other text groups in the tradition?

The following list gives Byzantine readings (i.e. those supported by mss from at least more than one of *d n* or *t*) supported by no more than two other text groups; these will be identified within parentheses at the beginning of the citations. Scattered ms support beyond these may not exceed 12 mss if two groups support the reading, six mss if only one further group supports it. Patristic support will be disre-

garded. Readings which qualify for listing which occur in *Lists 1* and *2* above as well as those in *Lists 3* and *4* of Chapter I will not be repeated, but their evidence will be summarized in the final discussion.

List 4

- 13 (f x) Ἰσαχάρ] ισαχαρ 707 57-126-422 d f n⁻⁷⁵ 321 t⁻⁸⁴ x 18 55 59 646 Latcod 100 Arm Sa⁴
- 13 (C x) om καί 376 C d 75 x 527 68 646'
- 15 (f) πέντε καὶ ἐβδομήκοντα] εβδ. πεντε 126 d⁻¹⁰⁶ f^{-56txt} 458
- 110 (O b) πληθυνθῆ] -νθωσιν (cvar) O⁻³⁷⁶ 126 b d n⁻⁶²⁸ t Latcod 100 Aeth Arm Co Syh^{txt}
- 23 (x) om αὐτοῦ F d 370 x 318 59
- 25 (oI C) ἀνείλατο] -λετο oI-135 C''^{-(126s)} 108 d⁻⁶¹⁰ 628^c 321 t⁻⁸⁴ 128' 18^c 55^c 646
- 28 (b) ἐλθοῦσα] απελθ. 64^{mg}-82 b d⁻⁶¹⁰ 321^{mg} t 55 509 Aeth^C
- 33 (x) κατακαίεται] κατεκαίετο d⁻¹⁰⁶ 134-370 x
- 36 (O C) Μωσῆς] μωσης 72-135-426-oI C'' d⁻¹⁰⁶ n 121 424 Carl 49
- 311 (O C) idem] μωσης O⁻³⁷⁶ 618-135 C'-25-313'-422-615 44-107' n 127*
- 312 (b s) Μωσῆ] προς μωσην (c var) 58-426 b d⁻¹⁰⁶ 129-246 n⁻⁶²⁸ s t 392-527 18 55 Syh^{mg}
- 322 (b x) σκυλεύσετε] συσκευασατε M 426-618 16-52-126-552 b d⁻⁴⁴ 458 343 370 x 527 18 55
- 46 (C s) αὐτοῦ 1°] + (cvar) και ειπεν εξενεγκε την χειρα σου εκ του κολπου σου C'' 44' n⁻⁶²⁸ s⁻³²¹ t 318 630 18 Aeth Syh^{Lmg}
- 48 (s) τῆς φωνῆς 1°] pr σου 106-107' 30-85'-127-344-730^{cprpm} t⁻¹³⁴
- 410 (O C) Μωσῆς] μωσης O⁻⁵⁸-135-707 C'-126-422 107'-125 n 619 799
- 411 (oI C) Μωσῆν] μωσην 135-426-oI C''⁻⁽⁷⁷⁾ 107'-125 n
- 420 (b) Μωσῆς 1°] μωσης 72-135-426 78-126 118'-537 107' n
- 426 (f s) αὐτοῦ] + ο αγγελος M^{mg} 426 126 19' d f n⁻⁽⁶²⁸⁾ s t 128' 18 55 76' 646
- 428 (O) Ἀαρών] pr τω B O d^{-125*} n t 527 18 76
- 522 (C x) Μωσῆς] μωσης 64-135-426 C'' 107'-125 n x
- 613 (x) Μωσῆν] μωσην 135-426 126 107' n⁻⁴⁵⁸ x
- 616 (x z) Γεδσών] γεδεων 126^{mg} d 75 t⁻⁴⁶ x 318 68'-120' Bo^{AcB}
- 616 (f x) καί 4°] + ταυτα 19' 44-107' 56'-129 n t x Ach Sa
- 617 (x z) Γεδσών] γεδεων 72 16 d 53' 74'-84 x 68'-120' 59 Bo^{AcB}
- 620 (z) Ἰωχάβεδ] -βεθ M 707 d n⁻⁶²⁸ t⁻⁴⁶ z⁻⁶³⁰ 18 130 799 Arm
- 625 (x) αὐται] + δε d⁻¹²⁵ n t x
- 629 (oI) Μωσῆν] μωσην 135-426-oI 126-413* 107' n 619
- 710 (y) τῶν 1°] pr εναντιον 106(mg) n⁻⁽⁶²⁸⁾ t y⁻¹²¹ 55
- 719 (O) Μωσῆν] μωσην 15-72-135-426-oI 126 107' n
- 720 (O b) καθάπερ] καθα O⁻³⁷⁶-707 14 b 107' n 527 799
- 83 (b) βατράχους] pr τους 64^{mg} b d n 343' t 318'
- 85 (b) om σου 2° 707 b d 127-628 t 121-527 128' 55 Arab
- 88 (f) κύριον] pr τον (την 46) d 56^c-129-246 t
- 812 (oI C) Φαραώ 2°] pr τω F M 82^{mg}-426-oI C''⁻⁵⁴ 414' 552 d⁻⁶¹⁰ 53' 628 730 t⁻⁴⁶ 527 128' 18 55 646
- 814 (f z) ὥξεν] επωζ. M 29 d f t 121-527 z 18 76' 130 509
- 822 (b z) κύριος 2°] θεος A 29-82 b d t 121 z 130 509 646 Arab Bo
- 830 (O) Μωσῆς] μωσης O⁻⁵⁸-15-135 107'-125 n 619 646*
- 92 (b) μὲν οὖν] δε 72 b 44' 53' n 527 76' Aeth
- 96 (C b) οὐδέν] ουδε εν M 72 C''⁻¹²⁶ (552^{txt}) b d⁻¹⁰⁶ 628 t⁻⁽⁴⁶⁾ 392*(cprpm) 18 646
- 97 (f z) τῶν 1°] pr παντων B 82 106-107' 56'-129 458' t⁻⁽⁴⁶⁾ 318 z 55 Syh
- 99 (s) Αἰγύπτου 2°] -πτω d s⁻³⁰ t⁻⁸⁴ 392 55* 130 319 509
- 911 (oI y) ἐν 1°] + τε 64^{mg}-381' d n⁻⁶²⁸ 30'-321^{mg}(vid) t y⁻¹²¹ 18 646 Arm
- 917 (O) ἐμποιῇ] αντιποιη 58'-426^c 126 19' d n t 18 646
- 919 (oI' s) ἄν] εαν M 426-oI' 44-125' s t⁻⁷⁴ 121' 68' 18 55 59 130 509 646
- 933 (b s) ἀπό] παρα b d⁻⁽¹²⁵⁾ 246 n 30'-85'^{txt}-343' t⁻⁴⁶
- 107 (oI C) om τοῦτο A* oI-29 C'' d t 121 68' 509 Arab Bo

- 1028 (s) πρόσχε] pr και 72 126 d 246 n s t 619 18 646 Latcod 101 Aeth Bo^B
 111 (z) εξαποστέλλη] -στειλη 15-376 d⁻⁶¹⁰ t z^{-122*}
 112 (f) πλησίον 1°] $\cap$ 2° B* d 53'-129^{txt} 458 t⁻⁴⁶ 68'-120
 124 (z) συναριθμήσετε] -σεται A B 19 44-125' 127 t⁻⁸⁴ z⁻¹²⁸ 76' 424
 127 (O) ἐν] pr και O⁻⁴²⁶ 131^c-552 d 246 n 85' t 59
 1214 (b) om ἐορτήν 15 b d 628 t 128 59
 1217 (f x) φυλάξεσθε] -ξασθε A 126-422 d^{-610c} f⁻²⁴⁶ 134 x 318 59 76' 646'
 1225 (x) φυλάξεσθε] pr και d n t x 392 18 130 799
 1229 (x) πρωτοτόκου 1°] pr του 82 19' 44'-107 127 t x 120-128 799
 1242 (s) κυρίω 2°] pr τω F 135-426-707^(mg) d n s t⁽⁻⁷⁴⁾ 59
 138 (s) ἐποίησεν] + μοι 707 d 246 n s t⁻⁴⁶ 130 Arm
 139 (z) κύριος] + ο θς σου 58 106-107' 56-129 n t 120-128'-628 Sa
 1316 (s x) σε] με F 15-29-376 d 127 s^{-321mg} t x 120 55 59^(mg) 76' 509 799 Syh
 149 (b f) οἱ ἱππεῖς] et ἡ στρατιά tr 29' 426 b d 53'-56*^{et c2}-246 n 30' t 392-527 509 Arab Bo
 1417 (f) Φαραώ 1°] + και των θεραποντων αυτου 381' 57 d⁻¹²⁵ f⁻¹²⁹ n⁻¹²⁷ t 46 Arab
 1420 (oI C'') σκότος] et γνόφος tr F M 15-29-135-376-oI C'' 19' d t 392 18 46 59 76' 509 Bo
 Pal Syh
 1425 (O f) εἶπαν] ειπον F^b O⁻⁴²⁶-381'-707 73-500 d f⁻¹²⁹ n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 527 76
 151 (b f) εἶπαν] ειπον 376-381'-707 57 118'-537 d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ f⁻¹²⁹ n 527 46 59 76
 163 (O b) εἶπαν] ειπον O⁻⁵⁸-707 500 b d⁻¹²⁵ n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 392-527 128'-628 18 76
 168 (C) ἀλλ' ἢ] αλλα 376 C'' d 53 75 321^{mg} t 799
 169 (O) Μωσῆς] μωσης O⁻³⁷⁶-15 126 106-125' n
 1611 (O) Μωσῆν] μωσην O⁻³⁷⁶-15 126 107'-125 n
 1613 (b x) om δέ 2° B F 707 131* b d⁻⁴⁴ 56* 127 t x 392 120 130 799
 1615 (O b) εἶπαν] ειπον F^b M O⁻⁵⁸-381'-707 126-500 118'-537 d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 527 18 46 59 76
 173 (b) Μωσῆν] -ση 82 551 b 44-107' t⁻⁷⁴ 121
 174 (O) Μωσῆς] μωσης O⁻³⁷⁶-15 107' n 730 619 18
 178 (f) Ἰσραήλ] pr τον F 376 551 d f n t 527 799
 1710 (f z) παρτάξατο] pr εξελθων B F^b vid 58-82' 19' 44' f n t 318' z 55 799 Co
 189 (b z) αὐτοῦς] + κς 15'-58 b⁽⁻¹⁹⁾ 107' n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 74' 121-392 z⁻⁶³⁰
 1811 (x) ἐπέθεντο] -θετο 82* 44-107' n⁻¹²⁷ t x 121^c 128'-628 Sa
 1820 (f x) διαμαρτυρῇ] -ρει 82 313* 19' d f⁻¹²⁹ n⁻¹²⁷ 85 84 x 318 55* 59 76' 799
 1923 (O) Μωσῆς] μωσης O⁻³⁷⁶-15 107'-125 n
 2018 (y) καπνίζον] -ζομενον 29 d 343 t y⁻¹²¹ 76' 509
 224 (x) αὐτά] αυτω 126 19 d 53 75 x 128-407* 426
 2215 (oI b) ἡ 1°] post αὐτοῦ 1° tr A F oI-29 b d t 392 55 59 509 Latcod 103 Arm
 2218 (b x) περιποιήσετε] περιβιώσετε A F 29^c b^{-118mg} 44-107'-125^c 127 321-343-344^c t x 392
 68' 18^c 424
 2219 (f) αὐτοῦς] αυτον 767 19 d⁻¹⁰⁶ f^{-56*} n⁻⁴⁵⁸ t 527 799 Aeth Bo^A Syh
 2229 (f y) ληνοῦ] pr της 707 d⁻¹²⁵ 53'-56 n 85'-130 t y 799
 2231 (b z) ἀποροῦσθε] -ψετε (cvar) A F F^b 15-58 b 107' 56 127 t 392 120'-128' 646 Co Syh
 2311 (x) ἀνήσεις] ανοισεις 739 d⁻¹⁰⁷ 458 x
 2331 (z) ὤμων] σου 29 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ t z 426 509 Bo
 247 (O) εἶπαν] ειπον F^b O⁻⁵⁸-381'-707 107'-125 53' n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 527
 2413 (oI C) εἰς] επι A M oI-29 C''⁻¹²⁶ d⁻⁴⁴ 56* t 392 68' 18 46 59 424 509 646' Bo(vid)
 2512 (x) αὐτά] αυτους 29 d t x 122 76 424
 2516 (b) πήχεων] πηχων F 82 118'-537 d 75 t 55 59
 2532 (z) καρυίσκους] -σκοις d⁻⁴⁴ 370^s 120'-128'-628 59 426 646
 2532 (z) οὐτως] ουτω 58 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ 321* t⁻¹³⁴ 68'-128'-628 426
 262 (b s) ὁκτώ καὶ εἴκοσι πήχεων] εικοσι (+ και b La Syh) οκτω πηχ. (-χων 767) 767 b d⁻¹⁰⁶ n
 s 527 Latcod 100 Syh
 262 (b) εὖρος] pr το b d n t
 2611 (s) ἔν] pr εις M^{mg} 767 d 246 n s t 126
 2612 (y) σκηνῆς 2°] $\cap$ 3° d⁻⁴⁴ 30' t y⁻³⁹² Syh^L
 276 (O z) φορεῖς 1°] αναφορεις B^c F^a F^b O⁻⁷² 707 d 129 n⁻¹²⁷ t z⁻¹²⁶ 76' 426
 277 (O z) idem 2°] αναφορεις B^c F^a F^b O⁻⁷² 707 d 129 t 318 z⁻¹²⁶ 76' 426 509
 2712 (O) τό 2°] της O⁻³⁷⁶ d n t⁻³⁷⁰ 128 18

- 2718 (x) εἶρος] pr το 707-767 $d^{(-106)}$ 129 n t x 527
 2718 (oI f) πήχεων] πηχων B F 64* -oII-707 $d^{(-106)}$ f-129 t 392 55 59 76' 509 799
 284 (O) μοι] εμοι O(-58) d^{-44} n t
 2810 (b z) om τά 1° F 767 b 44 129-246* n-127 30 z 799
 2812 (f) ἐναντι] εναντιον 58-376-618* 19 d 53'-129 t
 2817 (z) καθυφανεις] συγκαθ. (συ καθ. 75c; cvar) F^a M^{ms} 767 d 246 n t 126-128c-628-630
 2823 (f z) εισιόντι] εισιων (cvar) F^a 707 d f-129 n t 126-128'-628 799 Latcod 100
 2830 (b) κώδωνα] pr και F b d(-610) t 426 799
 295 (C x) αὐτῷ] αυτο C"-52 d^{-610} 56' n-127 343 x-71* 628 18 46* 646
 298 (f z) αὐτούς] + τους F^a M 707 d^{-610} 53'-246 127 t 392 z-628 18 Sa
 2943 (C s) καί 2°] pr και αγιασθησομαι εν τοις υιοις ιηλ (αυτοις pro τ. υ. ιηλ 75) C"-16 52 n s t
 628c-630
 2946 (s) αὐτοῖς] + θς 707 d n 85-130-321^{txt}-343*-344^{txt} t 527(2°)
 309 (b f) θυσίαν] θυσιας F M 29 b d 53'-129 30*-730 t 18 46 59 319* 509 646
 3010 (b f) κυρίῳ] pr τω A 25 b d f-129 84 121 799
 3020 (C x) κυρίῳ] pr τω A 58-376 C" d^{-106} t 71' 646
 3115 (C s) ἔργα] pr τα 376-767 C" d n s t 59 426 646
 323 (C z) περιείλαντο] -λοντο M cl d n 130-321' t-84 z 18 55c 646
 3211 (z) θυμοῖ] θυμουσαι 767 d 127 130^{ms}-321'^{ms} t 126-128'-628 319
 3211 (b x) ισχύι] + σου 707-767 b d n t x 426 Latcodd 100 104(vid) Arab Sa
 3227 (b) ἐπί 2°] εις 376 414' b d 129 t 527 Latcod 100 Co Syh
 331 (b) ἱακῶβ] pr τω b 107' 129 127 t-84
 335 (b z) ἐπαγάγω] εγω επαξω b d t 392 126-128'-628 799
 336 (C z) περιείλαντο] -λοντο M' C'-57 $d n^{-127}$ 130-321' t-84 z 18 55c 426 646
 3319 (b x) κύριος] κν F^b 58^{txt}-708-767 413 b d 56*-246 n t 71' 121c-318 628-630 426
 3410 (O z) ποιήσω 1°] pr και M' O'-376 19' d 129-246 n 30 t 392 126-128'-628 18 319 426
 509 Latcod 103 Aeth Arab Arm Bo
 3411 (O x) ἐκβάλλω] εκβαλω O-376-15-29 739 d 53-129c 458 t-370c x-619 318 68' 59 Latcod 103
 Co
 3415 (C s) ἐκπορνεύσωσιν] + σε M^{ms} 58-707-767 C" d n s t 18
 3522 (x) πᾶς ᾧ] πασων ων d 129 t 71'
 3527 (oI f) τῆς 2°] pr τους F oI-707 d^{-125} f t-84 527 318 799
 3533 (C s) ξύλα] ξυλικά C" d n 30'-85^{txt}-130-321'^{txt}-344* t-76* 527 799
 361 (oI) ἔργα] + τα F M' oI-15' 44' 129 n t-84 318' 128'-628 18c 55*
 362 (C s) σοφίαν] συνεσιν M^{ms} 29 C" d 56' n 30'-85-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-344*(vid) t 46 509 799 Bo
 3633 (C z) τὸ λῶμα] του λωματος 29 C d 53 458 t 527 68'-120' 46 319 509
 3640 (C s) ὑακίνθινον] pr το C" d 56' n s t 799
 371 (oII b) τῇ σκηנῇ] την σκηνην oII-82 16-78 b d n t 527 392 126 46 55 426 509 Latcodd 100
 104
 3711 (z) πήχεων 2°] πηχων 58 d t 68'-120' 509
 388 (z) σκιαζόντας] συσχ. d 246 t 126-128'-628
 3813 (b) ἡ φωτίζει] την φωτιζουσαν 118'-537 d 246 n t 121
 3822 (O) τοῖς 1°] pr εν O d n-127 t 128 509 Syh
 4029 (oI) ἐπλήσθη] ενεπλ. F oI d-44 730 t-84 318

The following table summarizes the evidence of the above list concerning the relations between the Byzantine groups and the other text groups.

	<i>1 group</i>	<i>2 groups</i>	<i>totals</i>
O	13	12	25
<i>oI-II</i>	3	12	15
C	1	24	25
<i>b</i>	13	24	37
<i>f</i>	7	18	25
<i>s</i>	7	13	20
<i>x</i>	12	17	29
<i>y</i>	3	2	5
<i>z</i>	11	18	29

To these must be added the support from *List 1* and *List 2*. For *List 1* the following summary details the evidence: 46 O *f*; 47 O *y*; 10₁ O *b*; 11₂ O; 12₃₂ O *x*; 13₁₁ O *x*; 14₁₀ O; 18₅ O; 21₆ O; 29₂₈ O; 30₁₉ O C; 32₁₂ O C; 33₄ O; 33₇(1°) O; 33₇(2°) O *b*; 35₇ O; 36₇ O. For *List 2*: 5₁ O C; 8₂₉ O; 9₁₀ O C; 12₇ O *s*; 16₂₉ *s*; 18₁₀ *s* *x*; 21₈ O *s*; 22₂₅ *oI' b*; 23₇ O *s*; 24₁₄ *oI' C*; 27₁₀ O *s*; 31₁₅ O *y*; 40₂₈ C *s*. For *List 3* of Chap. I: 8₉ *f* *s*; 9₂₂ O *x*; 12₂₅ *x*; 12₃₁ *x*; 16₁₆ O *s*; 17₃ O; 18₁₈ C *s*; 21₂₇ O *b*; 28₂₉ O *s*; 30₈ O *s*; 32₂₀ C *s*; 33₅ O, and for *List 4* of Chap. I: 10₂₈ O; 35₂₃ O *x*. The totals for these lists are: Double support O 21; *oI' 2*; C 8; *b 4*; *f 2*; *s 12*; *x 5*; *y 2*. With single group support: O 13; *s 1*, and *x 2*.

The final totals are as follows: O 59; *oI' 17*; C 33; *b 41*; *f 27*; *s 33*; *x 36*; *y 7*, and *z 29*. The order of support is O *b x C* and *s, z f oI' y*.

Chapter III: The Catena Text

Mss supporting the Catena type text have been divided into three groups, C as the major group consisting of mss 14-16-77-131-500-739, a first subgroup, *cI*, consisting of 57-73-78-413-550-552, and a second subgroup, *cII*, with 25-52-54-126-313-414-422-551-615-761 as members. Ms 54 leaves the group for the *n* text at 40¹⁴; 126 becomes a supporter of the *z* text at 25⁶.

A. The assignment of a ms to one of these three text groups should not be considered to be an absolute one; though these mss usually remain true to their assignment it should be noted that some mss in particular tend to some aberrancy. For C this is particularly true for 131^c (or 131^{mg}) and 77. Occasionally both fail to support a C reading; the following may be noted: 14₂ τοῖς υἱοῖς] τοὺς υἱοὺς C^{-77 131^c}; 14₁₁ μνήματα] μνημα C^{-77 131^c}; and 14₁₂ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίοις 1°] τοὺς αἰγυπτίους C^{-77 131^c}.

List 1 consists of readings supported by C but lacking the support of ms 77.

List 1

- 10₁₀ ἔστω] ἐσται C^{'-77-422 537 84 646*}
 21₂₀ δίχη] διχην C⁻⁷⁷
 22₁₁ αὐτόν] αὐτο (aut αὐτω) 767 C⁻⁷⁷
 23₂₈ fin] + (c var) καὶ (+ τοὺς s Bo) φερεζαίους καὶ τοὺς γεργεσαίους καὶ τοὺς ιεβουσαιούς C^{'-77 246 s 646 Bo}
 26₁ ἐργασία] -σιαν 767 C^{'-77 118'-537 44 n s 126 46 424 Cyr Ad 633 Latcod 102 Arm}
 28₂₀ στίχον] στιχων C^{-77-313-615*-761* 527* 126* Bo}
 28₃₅ ποιητοῦ] -λτουν C⁻⁷⁷
 32₃₄ προπορεύσεται] -ρενεταί B 15-72-οΙ C^{-77 19 56-129 130 318' 319 Clem I 124 Eus VI 238 Syh}
 34₁₁ σύ] σοι 707 C^{-77 30 628*}
 34₁₃ συντρίψετε] -ψατε O⁻⁷⁶⁷ C^{-77c-761c 246* n⁻¹²⁷ 130* 318 407 55* 319 426 509 799}

The corrector of ms 131 based corrections on a non-Catena text. List 2 is limited to variants supported by C but not by 131^c (or 131^{mg}). It is not intended as a study of 131^c; it merely illustrates the aberrancy of 131^c.

List 2

- 2₁ Λευί 1°] ∩ 2° C^{-131^{mg}}
 10₂₆ om ὁπλήν — λημψόμεθα C^{-131^c} 19-108^{txt}: homoiot
 12₄₆ om καὶ C^{-131^c}
 14₂₁ om ἐν 58-618* C^{-131^{mg}} 75 74 x 392 55 76' 130 799 Eus VI 98 99
 16₂₂ δέοντα] δεον C^{-131^c}-57-78-422* 53
 20₁₉ om σύ 618*(cprm) C^{-131^c}-78 Phil III 235^{ap}
 20₂₄ ἐπονομάσω] -σωσιν (c var) C^{'-131^c} Bo
 23₂₂ om ἀκοῇ A F M οΙ-29 C^{'-131^c} b 125 56* 458 318 68' 46 59 424 509 Aeth Syh
 23₂₅ ἀφ' ὑμῶν] ἀπο σου C^{'-131^c} 55 646 Phil Ex II 18 Aeth-FGH
 24₁ κύριον] με 82'-376 C^{'-131^c} 127^c s 527 424 646 Latcod 102
 25₈ om πάντων 64^{txt}-381' C^{'-131^c} 424 646 Tht Ex 139^{tc}

- 2511 δεύτερον] ετερον οΙ C"-131c 646 Arm
 2538 αὐτῆς 1°] ∩ 2° C"-131c 53' 318 Latcod 100
 261 om ἐκ οΙ C"-131c 424
 263 om δέ C"-131c 118'-537 246 126 424 Latcod 102 Aeth Arm Syh
 2613 τούτου 1°] ∩ 2° 29-767 C-131c-25 γ-527 128-628 509 Latcod 96 Aeth Bo^{A,B}
 2617 στύλοις] ξύλοις C-131c
 2635 μέρους 1°] μερος 707-767 C-131c-52 b n
 2720 om σύ 72-381' C'-131c 106 f-129 458 130^{txt}-321^{txt}-344* x 59 424 426 Bo
 2720 σύνταξον] συναξον C'-131c 413-422 424
 [2827] om δύο 1° C"-131c s 630 18^{txt} 646
 2914 κρέα] κερατα F 15-64* C"-131c 414' 527
 2924 καί 1°] ∩ 2° C-131mg
 301 om θυμιάματος C-131c 53'
 3030 om μοι C-131c
 337 παρεμβολῆς 1°] ∩ 2° B* 29-72 C-131mg-25^{txt}-761 107'-125 134 68'-120' 46 319 646 Bo
 357 fin] + (c var) και ελαιον της χρισεως και το θυμαμα της συνθεσεως C"-131mg n-127
 85-130-321'
 3530 om ἐξ ὀνόματος F C"-131mg 424 Aeth-CG

The above lists should not mislead anyone into thinking that C is not a true group. As the later lists in this study will illustrate abundantly C as well as the subgroups usually are complete in their support of Catena text variants.

The subgroup *cI* needs very little comment. Instances in which *cI* alone support a variant text do occur occasionally and can be examined in *List 6*. The only aberrancy worthy of note occurs at 3228 to 3319 where the four mss 73'-550' do not have the Catena text, so that within this section only 57' remains within the *cI* family. *List 3* contains evidence for the separate textual character of these four mss.

List 3

- 3229 om αὐτοῖς 58 73'-550' Bas III 368 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 338 σκηνήν 1°] + την εξω της παρεμβολῆς M' οΙ-15' 73'-550' b-314 44 f 55 18 Co
 339 τῶν θυρῶν] την θυραν B 15'-376 73'-550' f 392 126 55 799 Latcod 100 Ambr Ps duod
 XLIII 28.2 Luc Conven 1 Aeth Sa = $\mathfrak{M}$
 3310 idem 15 73'-550' f-129 527 799 Latcod 100 Luc Conven 1 Aeth = $\mathfrak{M}$
 3311 ἐκ τῆς σκηνῆς] εξω της παρεμβολῆς 73'-550' Aeth
 3312 οἶδα] pr οτι 73'-550' Arm
 3316 ἐνδοξασθησόμεθα] -σομαι B(mg) M^{txt} 73'-550'-551 108* f-129 68' 18 55

Little can be said about the text represented by this group. In one case (3229) the omission equals $\mathfrak{M}$, and twice (339, 10) a plural nominal becomes singular as in $\mathfrak{M}$. Out of the seven readings given in the list four are also supported by the *f* group (338, 9, 10, 16), but whether this is significant or not is uncertain since the sample is too small for making certain conclusions concerning either the nature of the variant text or of its textual relations.

The second subgroup, *cII*, is the least cohesive of the three groups, though again the mss in it usually join all other witnesses to produce C". Of particular interest is the formation of two smaller groups within the *cII* text; these are 52'-313' (sometimes joined by 126), and 54-414'.

List 4 gives all instances of unique support of a variant text by at least three of 52'-126-313'.

List 4

- 34 *Μωυση Μωυση*] *μωση* 52'-761; cf also *semel scr* 313 53'
 320 *om εν 1° — μου* 52'-126-761; cf also *om εν 1° — θαυμασιους* 313
 320 *ἐξαποστελεῖ*] *-στελω* 126-313'-615; cf also *-τελλω* 52
 49 *τοῦ ὕδατος / τοῦ ποταμοῦ*] *tr* 52'-126-313'
 415 *ἄ*] *pr εις* 313'-615
 66 *καί 2°*] *∩ 3°* 52'-126-761
 623 *Ἐλεάζαρ*] *∩ (25)* 52'-313'
 625 *γενέσεις*] *γενος* 52'-126-313'
 78 *Μωυσην*] *μωνσεα* 52'-313'
 92 *ἔτι*] *οτι* 52'-313'
 99 *τετράποσιν*] *κτηνεσιν* 52'-126-313'
 928 *προσθήσεσθε*] *προσθησω* (-*θησε* 313-615*) 52'-313'
 1213 *ἐκεῖ*] *οικει* 313'-615; *οικειν* 52-126
 1213 *γῆ*] *τη* 52'-313'
 1238 *βόες*] *βοας* 52'-313'
 181 *γάρ*] *δε* 52'-313'
 1910 *τῷ λαῷ*] *προς τον λαον* 52'-126-313'
 1911 *ἐναντίον*] *pr και* 52'-126-313'
 1920 *Μωυσην*] *pr προς* 52^{txt}-313'-615
 2024 *ὑμῶν 1°*] *υμιν* 52'-126-313'
 224 *κλέμμα*] *κρεμμα* 52-313'
 2311 *om σου 1°* 52-126-615^c-761
 2321 *om μή 2°* 52'-126-313'
 255 *om κριῶν* 52'-313'
 2631 *om αὐτό* 52'-761
 275 *ὑποθήσεις*] *υπερθησεις* 52'-313'
 281 *Ἰθαμάρ*] *ιεθαμαρ* 52'-313'
 2927 *αὐτοῦ*] *∩ (28)* 52'-313'
 304 *om εν 2°* 52'-313'
 3013 *διδράχμου 1°*] *-γματος* 52'-761; *-γματος* 313
 3521 *ψυχῇ*] *καρδια* 52'-313'
 3615 *ὑακίνθου*] *βυσσου* 52'-761
 3815 *ἐξέχοντες*] *εχοντες* 52'-761
 3817 *αὐτῆς 2°*] *αυτας* 52'-313'

List 5 presents the evidence for 54-414' as a group within the *cII* tradition. As in the case of List 4 only readings unique to the mss are given.

List 5

- | | |
|--|--|
| 310 <i>Αἰγύπτου 1°</i>] <i>∩ (11) 1°</i> 54-414' | 1413 <i>σήμερον 1°</i>] <i>∩ 2°</i> 54-414' |
| 418 <i>ἀποστρέψω</i>] <i>απελθω</i> 54-414' | 1811 <i>θεοῦς</i>] <i>εχθρους</i> 54-414' |
| 421 <i>Φαραώ</i>] <i>∩ (22)</i> 54-414-551 ^{txt} | 2411 <i>οὐδὲ εἷς</i>] <i>οὐδε τις</i> 54-414' |
| 514 <i>κατασταθέντες</i>] <i>-σταντες</i> 54-414' | 2511 <i>ἐλάσεις</i>] <i>ποιησεις</i> 54-414' |
| 75 <i>κύριος</i>] <i>pr ο</i> 54-414' | 276 <i>om καί 2° — (8) αὐτό</i> 54-414' |
| 822 <i>om γῆν</i> 54-414' | 283 <i>τό</i>] <i>τον</i> 54-414' |
| 1025 <i>ἡμῶν</i>] <i>∩ (26) 3°</i> 54-414' | 2922 <i>αὐτῇ</i>] <i>αρτι</i> 54-414' |
| 114 <i>περὶ μέσας νύκτας</i>] <i>ad fin tr</i> 54-414' | 2936 <i>ἐν — σε</i>] <i>και αγιασεις αυτο</i> 54-414' |
| 1218 <i>μηνὸς τοῦ πρώτου</i>] <i>πρωτου μηνος</i> 54-414' | 312 <i>ἰδοῦ</i>] <i>+ εγω</i> 54-414' |
| 1222 <i>ἔως</i>] <i>ως</i> 54-414' | 3511 <i>αὐτῆς 1°</i>] <i>∩ (12)</i> 54-414' |
| 1239 <i>ἐξήνεγκαν</i>] <i>ηνεγκαν</i> 54-414' | 3628 <i>αὐτοῦ</i>] <i>εαυτου</i> 54-414' |

That the three mss 54-414' as well as 52'(-126)-313' constitute groups within the *cII* complex is clear from the two lists above. Were the lists expanded to include

readings almost unique, i.e. with the support of one or two scattered witnesses, the lists would be considerably larger.

B. That *C cI* and *cII* all belong to the same family immediately becomes clear when Catena text readings are examined. *List 6* presents unique Catena text variants. No distinction is made among *C*, *cI* and *cII* or any combination of them.

List 6

- 111 *Πιθώμ*] *πειθωφ* *C*"-54 77 78 126
 21 *Λευί* 1°] $\bigcap$ 2° *C*-131^{mg}
 214 *ἐμφανὲς γέγονεν*] *tr C*"
 310 *πρός*] *εἰς* *C*"-126
 314 *om καί* 1° *C*"-16 73 126 413 414'
 314 *ὁ θεός*] *pr* $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ *C*"
 315 *ὁ θεός* 1°] *pr* $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ *C*"
 316 *ὕμᾱς*] $\bigcap$ (17) *C*
 418 *ὕγιαίνων*] + *εἰς εἰρηνην* *C* = $\mathfrak{M}$
 420 *παιδία*] *τεκνα cII*-54 414' 422
 420 *παρά*] *απο* *C*"(-77)
 61 *πρός Μωυσῆν*] *τω μωυση* (cvar) *C*"-25* 78 500
 615 *Ἰαμίν*] *αμειμ C*
 623 *Ἰαμιναδάβ*] *ιαμιναβαδ C*-500-54-313-422; *ιαμινααδ cI*-552
 718 *οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι*] *post πειν* *tr C*"
 721 *ἐπώξεσεν*] *απωξεσεν C*"-73 126
 721 *οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι* | *πειν ὕδαρ*] *tr C*"
 83 *φυράμασίν*] *pr φρεασιν και* (+ *εν τοις 77*) *C*
 96 *ἐτελεύτησεν* 1°] + $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ (*και 16s*) *C*"-126 413
 919 *om οἱ* *C*"-16 126
 1026 *om ἡμῶν* 1° *C*"(-54 414')
 1026 *ἡμᾶς*] *ημεῖς C*"-16 25 414* 551
 111 *πρός Μωυσῆν*] (+ *τω 14*) *μωυση C*'-77-25-54-414'-422
 112 *παρά* 1° 2°] *απο C*"
 113 *om δέ* *C*'-73-54-422
 1211 *om καί* 1° *C*'-413-422 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 1230 *om μεγάλη* — *γῆ cI*
 1230 *ἐν αὐτῇ*] *εκει C*"-25 126 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 1246 *om καί* *C*-131^c
 1251 *om ἐν* *C*-52*-126
 1312 *ἀρσενικά* 1°] *αρρεν. C*-25-422
 1312 *ὅσα* — *ἀρσενικά* | *ἀγιάσεις*] *tr C*"
 1319 *τοὺς υἱοὺς*] *τοις υἱοις C*
 142 *Μαγδώλου*] *μαδ. C*-16
 146 *συναπήγαγεν*] *συνεπ. (cvar) C*"-126
 1415 *τοῖς υἱοῖς*] *τους υἱους 14'-25-131*-500'*
 1416 *εἰς μέσον*] *εν μεσω C*"-25 73 413
 1527 *ἦσαν*] *ην C*"-57 126
 1634 *Ἀαρών*] *pr ο C*'-550'-422
 181 *κύριος* 1°] *pr ο cI*
 185 *om καί* 2° — *Μωυσῆν C*-131
 2018 *καπνίζον*] + *ην C*"-126
 2024 *τὰ σωτήρια*] *τα του σ̄ριου C*
 2024 *om ἐν* *C*"
 2119 *τὰ ἱατρεῖα*] *τας (> 52'-126-313')* *ιατρείας C*"
 2126 *τοῦ ὀφθαλμοῦ*] *οφθαλμων C*
 2129 *ταῦρος* 2°] + *και C*'-500-25-54-313-414'

2214 ἀποθάνη] + η θηριαλωτον (aut -τος) γενηται cI'
 2214 ὁ δέ] και ο C-126
 2215 om οὐκ cI^{-57c 73}
 2231 om μοι C"
 246 προσέχεεν] -χυσεν (εχ. 126) C"
 2410 εἰστήκει] εστ. C"^{-57 126 414'}
 2510 om αὐτήν 1° C'-422
 2510 om καὶ ποιήσεις αὐτῇ cI
 2516 πλάτος] + αυτης (της 739) 14-16*-73-77'-413-739* = **ℳ**
 266 τῇ ἐτέρᾳ] της ετερας C"
 2610 τοῦ χεῖλους 2°] το χείλος C
 2617 στύλοις] ξύλοις C^{-131c}
 2619 om τῷ στύλῳ 1° C"^{-52' 761}
 2625 ὀκτώ] pr και C⁻⁵⁰⁰
 2637 om αἱ cI-422
 278 αὐτὸ κατὰ] και ποιησεις cI
 285 καὶ 2° — πορφύραν] post κόκκινον tr C"
 285 om τό 2° C"^{-52' 761}
 2814 ἐκ 1°] επι C"⁻⁵⁰⁰
 [2826] δώσεις] ποιησεις C'-422
 2833 ἐπιθήσεις] υποθ. C"
 2833 ἐπὶ 1°] υπο C"
 2833 πρόσωπον] pr το C⁻¹⁶
 2835 ποικιλοῦ] -λτουν C⁻⁷⁷
 295 Ἀαρών] pr τον C"⁻⁵⁰⁰ = **ℳ**
 2918 εἷς] pr εστιν C"⁽⁻⁵⁴⁾
 2924 καὶ 1°] ∩ 2° C^{-131mg}
 2924 om τὰς χεῖρας 2° C
 3030 om μοι C^{-131c}
 3035 μεμιγμένον] -γμενον cI
 3037 κυρίῳ] pr εν cI
 3038 ὡσαύτως] + ανηρ C"
 312 τῆς] pr τον C"
 314 om τό 2° C"^{-16 25 77 500 550'}
 316 ἐγώ] ιδου C"
 3110 Ἀαρών] pr και C"^{-52' 77 761}
 3319 παρελεύσομαι] προπαρ. C-25-52'-313-422
 3320 γὰρ μὴ] tr C"^{-16 78 413}
 3322 δ' ἄν] δε C"^{-54 77 413}
 3322 καὶ θήσω] καθησω C
 344 μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ] μετ αυτου C-414'
 3428 ταῦτα] ταυτης C
 3433 ἐπειδὴ] εγενετο οτε C
 356 κόκκινον] κοκκον C"^{-52' 761}
 358 εἷς 2°] pr και C"
 359 πάντα ὅσα] καθα (και 551) C"
 3510 om τά 1° C"^{-25 500}
 3528 om τό 57c-73'-550'
 3619 λιγύριον] -ριν C"^{-414' (500)}
 3719 καθά] pr και cII⁻⁴²²
 3820 τῆς θύρας] και τη θυρα C
 3911 ἐποίησαν 1°] ∩ 2° cII^{-25 422}
 3917 λύχνους 1°] μοχλους C
 3917 καύσεως] κακωσεως cII^{-25 422}
 3923 αὐτούς] αυτα 16-cII^{-25 422}
 4013 ἱερατείας] ιερων cII^{-25 422}
 4015 om τῷ δευτέρῳ ἔτει C

The largest number of variants in the above list concerns omissions (28) mostly of a single word: the article (9¹⁹ 26³⁷ 28⁵ 31⁴ 35¹⁰ 28); a conjunction (31⁴ 11³ 12¹¹ 46); a pronoun (10²⁶ 22³¹ 25¹⁰ 30³⁰); ἐν (12⁵¹ 20²⁴); οὐκ (22¹⁵); ἄν (33²²); an articulated noun is omitted at 26¹⁹ 29²⁴, and phrases at 18⁵ 25¹⁰ and 40¹⁵, and omissions due to homoiot occur at 2¹ 3¹⁶ 12³⁰ 29²⁴ 39¹¹.

Additions occur 21 times, only three of which consisting of more than one word (4¹⁸ 8³ 22¹⁴). Transpositions obtain six times. Change in nominal inflection may involve number (21²⁶), case (10²⁶ 13¹⁹ 14¹⁵ 26⁶ 10 30³⁵ 38²⁰), both number and case (34²⁸), or gender (21¹⁹ 39²³), whereas change in verbal inflection occurred only twice, involving number change at 15²⁷ and augment at 24¹⁰. No case of simplex for compound or the reverse occurs at all, but change in prepositional element in a compound is witnessed at 7²¹ 14⁶ 28³³ 33¹⁹. A δέ construction is changed into και at 22¹⁴; change in pronoun obtains at 34⁴ and in preposition at 3¹⁰ 4²⁰ 11²(twice) 14¹⁶ 28¹⁴ 33. Change in spelling of proper nouns is found at 1¹¹ 6¹⁵ 23 14², and the Attic spelling ἀρ-ρενικα obtains at 13¹².

Change in lexeme occurs as follows (with the Exod text in parentheses): 4²⁰ τεκνα (παιδιά); 12³⁰ εκεί (ἐν αὐτῇ); 24⁶ προσεχυσεν (προσέχεεν); 26¹⁷ ξυλοῖς (στυλοῖς); [28²⁶] ποιησεις (δώσεις); 28³⁵ ποικιλτουν (ποικιλοῦ); 31⁶ ἰδου (ἐγώ); 33²² καθησω (καὶ θήσω); 35⁶ κοκκον (κόκκινον); 36¹⁹ λιγυριν (λιγύριον); 39¹⁷ μοχλους (λύχνους); 39¹⁷ κακωσεως (καύσεως), and 40¹³ ιερων (ιερατείας). Change in construction is to be seen at 6¹ 11¹ (τω) μωυση (πρὸς Μωυσῆν); 20²⁴ τα του ὁριου (τὰ σωτήρια); 27⁸ και ποιησεις (αὐτὸ κατὰ); 34³³ εγενετο οτε (ἐπειδή), and 35⁹ καθα (πάντα ὅσα).

To broaden the base somewhat the following list contains Catena text readings with a maximum of four further witnesses.

List 7

- 119 αἱ 2°] pr ουτω(ς) και 72 C 44 Latcod 100
 311 Αἰγύπτου 1°] ∩ 2° C-78-761 44 458
 312 Μωυση] μωση (aut μωσει; bis scr 126) 64^(mg)-618 C"
 314 om και εἶπεν 2° C" Eus VIII 1.385 2.24 Tht Ex 102 Sa
 318 τριων ἡμερων] tr C 53' 730^c
 49 ἐκχεεις] εκχεης C"-54 73 77 126 414 108 610 55
 416 στόμα] pr εις C" 318 = 𐤀𐤋
 427 εις 1°] προς C-54-57-78-422-550' 424
 53 προσκέκληται] προσεπικεκλη. C"-14 126 550' 646
 58 καθ'] pr και C"-500 30' 527
 511 om ἄχυρα 64^{txt} C" 646
 67 ἐξαγαγών] εξαγων C"-57 126 500^o 628 121 646'
 613 Αἰγύπτου 1°] ∩ 2° 72 C 628
 613 γῆς] της CI-52'-54-313' 84
 623 Ἰθαμάρ] ιαθαμαρ M 15 C-16-57-78-422-550' 18 509
 625 Φουτιήλ] φουτουηλ (φατ. 25-126) C" 246 85
 629 om λέγων C'(-552^{mg})-25-54-414'-422 125
 74 σύν 2°] pr και C"(-77) 646
 710 καθάπερ] καθα 707 C-77-25-552 125'
 718 ἐποξέσει] αποξεσει C"-73 126 646
 722 κύριος] pr ο 64' C"-126 44 75
 88 ἐξαποστελῶ] -λλω 64*-708 C"-77 126 53 84

- 816 om τε 15 Cⁿ⁻¹²⁶ 424 646
 817 τό] pr παν C'-25-414'-422 392 130
 817 οί 1°] αι C'-25-54-422-551^c 107' 628
 817 οί 2°] αι C^{n-52*} (77) 78 (126) 414 319
 821 om τῆς cII-25 422 19 125
 826 θύσωμεν 2°] post Αἰγυπτίων 2° tr Cⁿ⁻¹²⁶ 646
 828 κύριον] pr τον Cⁿ⁻⁷⁸-422 246
 831 εἶπεν] + αὐτῷ 64^{mg} Cⁿ 318 Arab Bo^B
 831 οὐ κατελείφθη] οὐκ ἀπελ. (cvar) Cⁿ⁽⁻¹²⁶⁾ 53'
 910 om ἐναντίον Φαραώ C^{n(-414' 550^{txt})} Bo^A
 107 ἐξαπόστειλον] αποστ. 64* Cⁿ
 109 κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ] κῶ τω θῶ 381' Cⁿ 44 59
 1026 om ὀπλήν — λημψόμεθα C^{-131^c} 19-108^{txt}; homoiot
 1028 δ'] δε M 64' Cⁿ⁻⁵⁴ 73 126 413 414' 615^c
 111 om ἐπ' Cⁿ⁻¹²⁶ 413 730
 124 om ψυχῶν — αὐτῷ Cⁿ⁻⁵⁷ 126 424
 129 ἀλλ' ἢ] ἀλλὰ 376 Cⁿ⁻¹⁶ 126 313^c 422
 1221 πρὸς αὐτοῦς] αυτοις Cⁿ 424 646
 1221 ἐαυτοῖς πρόβατον] προβατα (-τον 52'-126-313*-761) εαυτοις Cⁿ 424
 1248 προσέλθῃ] -λθοι cIⁿ⁻¹²⁶ 550' 551 76
 137 fin] + επτα ημερας (tr 126) M^{mg} Cⁿ 392
 1320 Ὀδομ] ονθομ (aut -θωμ) C^{n-52'} 57 77 126 422 761 127 730 71
 1419 om καί 2° Cⁿ⁻²⁵ 52 126 Aeth = 𐤀𐤊
 1431 θεῷ] κῶ F^b cI 646 Or Rom 184 = 𐤀𐤊
 151 om τῷ 1° — λέγοντες 72 Cⁿ⁻⁵⁷ 126 131^{mg} 799
 166 κύριος ἐξήγαγεν] tr Cⁿ 646
 1612 κρέα] κρεας Cⁿ 646
 1620 ἐπ'] δι Cⁿ 646
 1626 ἔσται] εστιν (εστη 376) 376 Cⁿ 458 130 Cyr VI 681
 175 πορορεύου] πορευου C 799
 177 ἐπωνόμασεν] -σαν C-25-54-57-73-414'-422-550' 246 646
 1812 ἄρτον] αρτους C^{n-54*} 646
 1816 αὐτοῦς] αυτοις Cⁿ 19 106 76 646
 1921 θεόν] + επι το ορος Cⁿ 392
 2019 om σύ 618*(cpr m) C^{-131^c-78} Phil III 235^{ap}
 2022 λελάληκα] ελαλησα Cⁿ 424 646
 2024 ἐπονομάσω] -σωσιν (cvar) C^{n-131^c} Bo
 211 δικαιώματα] + μου Cⁿ 646 Or Sel 293
 211 ἃ παραθήσεις] απαριθμήσεις 72 Cⁿ 646
 218 αὐτῷ καθωμολογήσατο] ου καθωμ. αυτη (cvar) εν οφθαλμοις Cⁿ 730
 219 καθωμολογήσεται] -γηση (cvar) 15* Cⁿ 730 646
 2121 om μίαν C 128
 2126 ἐκτυφλώσῃ] τυφλ. 72 C 59 Cyr Ad 552^v
 2127 om αὐτοῦ C 127 Arm
 2128 τὰ κρέα] το κρεας Cⁿ 458 424 Latcod 100
 2133 μῆ] pr ου Cⁿ⁻²⁵ 646
 2136 ταύρου] + (cvar) ο κυριος αυτου αποτισει το αργυριον αντι του ταυρου Cⁿ⁻⁷⁷ 646
 224 ὄνου] pr του C'-422 44 130
 225 βέλτιστα 1°] καλλιστα Cⁿ 646
 2214 παρά] απο Cⁿ 68
 2215 om μετ' αὐτοῦ C^{n(-16 131)} 458 Aeth^C
 2217 om αὐτήν 72 Cⁿ⁻⁵⁵⁰ 646
 2224 θυμῷ] + προς υμας Cⁿ⁻⁷³⁹ 646 LatCyp Quir III 113^{ap}
 2229 om σου 1° Cⁿ 424 Anast 1808 Arm
 234 τῷ ὑποζυγίῳ] το υποζυγιον 376 C-77^c 75 46*
 237 ἔνεκεν] -κα cII-126 422 392
 2311 ὑπολειπόμενα] + αυτης (-τοις 25) Cⁿ 646

- 2313 εἶρηκα] ελαλησα C⁽⁻⁷⁷⁾-126 44 646
 2324 μὴ λατρεύσης] λατρευσῆς C" 646
 2325 μαλακίαν] πρ̄ πασαν C" 646 Sa
 2325 ἀφ' ὕμῶν] ἀπο σου C^{-131c} 55 646 Phil Ex II 18 Aeth-FGH = **℞**
 2327 om πάντας 64^{txt} C" 424 646 Arab
 246 Μωσῆς] πρ̄ ο C^{-551*} 646
 2411 οὐδὲ εἶς] οὐδεις 64*-376 C^{-54 73' 414' 500} 55
 2523 κύκλῳ 1°] $\cap$ 2° cI 53'
 2523 αὐτῇ 2°] αὐτην 381'-767 C
 2538 αὐτῆς 1°] $\cap$ 2° C^{-131c} 53' 318 Lat^{cod} 100
 262 ἔσται 1°] $\cap$ 2° C⁻¹³¹ 130
 263 om συνεχόμεναι 2° C^{-16 413 422} 730(mg) 55
 263 ἐκ τῆς ἐτέρας 2°] ἐκατερας C^{-(16) 77 414' (422)}-57-550' 730(mg)
 269 συνάψεις] συναξεις C 126
 274 om αὐτῷ C" 424 Aeth
 277 ἐν] πρ̄ ὥστε C^{-(54) 413 (414')} 321mg
 2713 δέκα 1°] $\cap$ 2° C⁽⁻⁷³⁹⁾ 318
 2714 τῶν ἰστίων] το ἰστιον 72 C^{-16c 77c}
 2717 κατηγορουμένοι] πρ̄ και C^{-550' 761} 318
 2720 σύνταξον] συναξον C^{-131c 413-422} 424
 2814 πεπλεγμένα] περιπεπλ. C" 318
 2819 λιγύριον] -ρις (aut λην.) C" 646
 2820 κατὰ] πρ̄ κατα τας γενεσεις αυτων (> 18) C 18^{sup lin}
 2820 σίχον] -χων C^{-77-313-615*-761* 527* 126*} Bo
 2828 ἐξ 1°] πρ̄ της αρχης C" 730 424 646
 2829 om καὶ 1° C⁻⁴¹³ 646
 294 θύρας] θυσιας C^{-25 131c 500 550' 551c} 646*
 295 στολάς] + τας αγιας 15-707 C" 527 318
 295 ποδήρη] + (※Syh^L) του επενδυματος C" 318 646 Syh = **℞**
 2910 ἔναντι] -ντιον 15 cI^{-52' 761}
 2912 ἐκχεεῖς] εκχεης 14'-25-54-78-131-313-413-414'-422-739 646
 2913 αὐτῶν] + θυμιασεις C" 646
 2914 κρέα] κερατα F 15-64* C^{-131c 414'} 527
 2916 προσχεεῖς] -χεης (προχ. 739) 14-16*-25-54-78-131-313-413-414'-422-500' 56
 2928 θυμάτων] θυμιαματων C⁻²⁵ 30'
 2935 om οὕτως C" 646'
 2940 κεκομμένῳ] + τω (+ τε 552) ενι C^{-25 (551)} 646
 2940 ἵν 1°] + οινου (οουνου 739) τω αμνω (+ τω ενι 57 646) C^{-54 414 (551)} 646
 2940 om τό C^{-(54 414')} 458 344*
 2946 om εἰμι 72 C" = **℞**
 301 om θυμιάματος C^{-131c} 53'
 303 om χρυσὴν 707 C 610 84^{txt} Bo
 307 αὐτοῦ 2°] + δια παντος C⁻⁽⁵⁴⁾ 646
 3033 αὐτοῦ 2°] τουτου C" 646
 3115 om τῷ M^{txt} C 18 426 509
 328 παρέβησαν] + γαρ C" 321c 424 646 Cyr Gl 529
 3215 om αἱ C" 85 318 426
 3216 ἔργον] εργα C" 646 Sa
 3218 φωνήν] φωνη (-νην 73) ην C^{-52 550c 552 615c 761} 646
 333 εισάξει] -ξεις C⁻²⁵⁻⁵⁷ 59
 333 om σε 1° C⁻²⁵⁻⁵⁷ 59
 3314 λέγει] + κς C^{-57' 30'} 646
 3315 πορεύη] προπορ. C⁻⁵⁷ 646 Bas II 437
 3319 μου 1°] + πορευομαι προ προσωπου σου τη δοξη μου C⁻¹⁶⁻⁵⁷ 646
 346 ἐκάλεσεν] ελαλησεν C" 321c 527
 3411 σύ] σοι 707 C⁻⁷⁷ 30 628* = **℞**
 3416 τοὺς νιούς] τοις υιοις 58 C^{-(25 54 413)} 527 319

3528 καὶ 3^o — fin] καὶ το θυμίαμα της συνθεσεως C" 121 = **MR**
 3530 om ἐξ ὀνόματος F C"-131^{mg} 424 Aeth^{-CG}
 3530 om υἱοῦ C"-131^{mg} 59 424
 368 Μωυση] μωσει 72 C'-16-52-422
 3612 Μωυση] μωσει 72 C'-552-414-422
 3613 ἐποίησαν] -σεν C"-14' 54 551 130-321^{cpr m} 799 Arm
 3615 ποικιλία] -λαιαι C-313-413-422-550' 424
 3626 ἐπέθηκαν 2^o] -κεν C"-550' 739* 85*
 3635 ἐποίησαν] -σεν C"-16 131^c 426 Syh^L
 3816 ἄκρον] ακρων C"-54 84 18 799 Phil III 49^{ap}
 3818 τοῖς στύλοις] τους στυλους C" 53'
 4019 ἐπέθηκεν] εθηκεν A* C"-16 85 646

List 7 adds to our knowledge of the nature of the Catena text though in many aspects it simply adds examples; thus 36 instances of omissions again concern the usual list of articles, conjunctions, pronouns, prepositions and particles; occasionally more than one word is omitted (314 910 124 151 2215 3530). Seven cases of omission are due to homoiot. Only four instances of transpositions are attested, though one might also consider here the more interesting *το θυμίαμα της συνθεσεως* for *καὶ τὴν σύνθεσιν τοῦ θυμιάματος* at 3528.

Plusses may involve articulation (722 828 224 246), *καὶ* (58 74 2717), *ωστε* (277), *γαρ* (328), a pronoun (831 211 2311), a preposition (416), the word for "all" (817 2325), *μή* to *ου μη* (2133), a clarifying noun or adjective (2828 2955 40 3314), phrase (137), or verb (2913). Longer plusses may involve a prepositional phrase (1921 2224 307), a double modifier (2940), or even an entire clause (2136 3319). The addition of a prepositional phrase at 218 also involved rewriting the context.

Change in nominal inflection as for the previous list may involve gender, number, case, or both number and case. Change in cases at 1221 meant change of a *πρός* construction to a simple dative. In contrast to List 6 this list has a substantial number of instances of change in verbal inflection. These consist of change in person (333), in number (177 3613 26 35), both person and number (2024), tense (67 88 1626 2022), voice (219), or mood (49 1248 2324 2912 16). There are no cases of change in pronoun, but there are a few involving prepositions (427 1620 2214 2910, and at 237 a variant form of a preposition). Change in prepositional element in a compound occurs at 53 718 831 107, whereas a compound is found instead of a simplex at 2814 3315, and the reverse change at 175 2126 4019.

The spelling of Moses' name is involved at 312 368 12; other changes in spelling of proper nouns occur at 623 *ιαθαμαρ* for *Ἰθαμάρ*; 625 *φουτουηλ* for *Φουτήλ* and 1320 *ονθομ* or *ονθωμ* for *Ὀθόμ*. Elision created *ουδεις* for *οὐδὲ εἰς* at 2411 and the reverse phenomenon obtains at 1028 with *δε*. Palaeographically inspired are 613 *της*, 211 *απαριθμησεις* and 263 *εκατερας*.

Only 12 cases of actual lexical change are witnessed. These are 710 *καθα* (*καθάπερ*); 129 *αλλα* (*ἀλλ' ἢ*); 1431 *κω* (*θεῶ*); 225 *καλλιστα* (*βέλτιστα*); 2313 *ελαλησα* (*εἶρηκα*); 269 *συναξεις* (*συνάψεις*); 2720 *συναξον* (*σύνταξον*); 2819 *λιγυρις* (*λιγύριον*); 294 *θυσιας* (*θύρας*); 2914 *κερατα* (*κρέα*); 2928 *θυμιαματων* (*θυμάτων*), and 346 *ελαλησεν* (*ἐκάλεσεν*).

Only eight instances in *List 7* are variants which equal $\mathfrak{M}$. Whether the Catena text should be considered to be a recension cannot be determined on the basis of correspondence with $\mathfrak{M}$. It seems to me best to think of this text as a popular though late text group, a text particularly though not exclusively favored by writers of catena mss.

C. How widespread the influence of this text type was felt, or better said, what the textual relations with other text groups are is investigated through *List 8*.

Since the Catena text was a popular text the list will be limited to instances with no more than two further text groups (and in disregard of scattered support) sharing a reading with C; as in *Lists 6* and *7* distinctions among C *cI* and *cII* will be disregarded for establishing a Catena reading. Since patristic evidence is irrelevant to our particular problem it will not be recorded. For such evidence one may consult the edition.

To qualify as a supporting text group at least half of its extant members must have the reading, except for *x* and *y* which must have over half. Nonetheless when six members or one of the subgroups of O" including at least one actual O member support a reading it will be recorded as O. To aid the reader the supporting text groups are given in parentheses at the head of each citation.

List 8

- 13 (*d x*) om *καί* 376 C *d* 75 *x* 527 68 646'
 115 (O *s*) om η F M 29'-135-376' C" 129 *s* 18 59 76' 509 646' Ach Aeth Sa Syh
 117 (O) *καθότι*] *καθώς* 72-oI-64^{mg} C"-551 44 59 646
 210 (*x*) *Μωσῆν*] *μωση* 64*(vid)-135-426-708 C"-57 414' 422 19' *x* 646
 217 (O *n*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσης* O-58-135 C-126 53' *n*-628
 220 (oI *s*) om *καί* 1° A F M oI-135-707 C"-77^c *s* 318 18 59 76' 646 Bo Sa'
 222 (O) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσης* 64*-72-135-426 C"-16 54 126 761 619 121 18
 225 (oI' *s*) *ἐπέιδεν*] *εἰσείδεν* (cvar) A F M oI-29'-135 C" 118' 56* *s* 121 18 509
 36 (*x z*) *εὐλαβεῖτο*] *ηὐλ.* M 15'-58-64' C"-739 *x z* 18 55 76 424
 38 (O *s*) om *καὶ εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτοῦς* A F M O'-58-29'-135 C"-57 56^{txt} *s* 121 18 59 130 509 799
 Arab Bo Syh^{Lxt}
 313 (O *f*) *ἐρωτήσουσιν*] *πρ και* (+ *ει* 664) O-82 C" *f*-56* 527 128' Aeth Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 315 (*n*) *μού*] *μοι* (*μη* 458) C-422 53' *n* 30 ^{Latcod} 100
 316 (oI' *s*) om *οὖν* A F M oI-64^{mg}-29'-135 C"-54 126 (414') *s*-730 121' 18 130 509 Bo
 319 (O *b*) om *Φαραώ* 426-707-oI-64^{mg} C" *b* 424 Carl 49 ^{Latcod} 100 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 322 (*b*) *ἀργυρᾷ*] *et χρυσᾷ* tr C *b* 44 53' ^{Latcod} 101
 41 (O *n*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσης* 72-135-426 C"-77 *n* 619
 41 (*z*) om *οὖν* B 15'-64* C" 19' 129 527 *z* Arm Bo
 46 (O *s*) *τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ*] *αὐτὴν* F M O'-15' (72) C"-126 44 129 *s* 121-527 18 55 59 76' 509
^{Latcod} 100 Arab Arm Bo = $\mathfrak{M}$
 49 (O) om *σοι* M 72-376-707-oI C" 44 458 18 424 Aeth-CGR Arab Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 410 (*s*) *ἤρξω*] *ἠρξαι* F M 64'-135-707 C"-414' *s*-321 370^c 121-392
 410 (*b*) *ἐγὼ εἰμι*] tr 64-72-618 C" 118'-537 56' 318-527 76' 799 ^{Latcod} 100 Arm
 414 (oI) *Ἀαρὼν*] *post σου* tr oI C" 53'
 420 (O) *παιδίᾳ*] + (⌘ Arm Syh) *αὐτου* F^b O C" 318 Aeth Arab Arm^{te} Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 424 (oI) om *κυρίου* F M oI-29-135 C"-131^c 121 59 424 509 799 Bo Syh
 51 (O *n*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσης* 72-135-426 C"-551 552 *n* 424
 51 (O *t*) *αὐτῷ*] *πρὸς φαραῶ* F M O C"-126 107' *t* 18 59 424 509 Aeth-CM Arab Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 54 (oI) om *ὁ* oI C"-126 413

- 57 (οΙ) συναγαγέτωσαν] συναγετ. οΙ-708 77-500-οΙ-550⁷⁶¹ 44 53' 458 85 128'
- 58 (Ο) κεκράγασιν] pr (※Syh) αυτοι 376' C'' 318 646 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 514 (οΙ) om του 2° οΙ C'' 44 392
- 514 (ς) ὑμῶν / τῆς πλινθείας] tr 707 C'' s-30' 527 646 Arm Bo
- 522 (ς) λαόν] + σου 135 C-16^s s-127 646 AethP
- 62 (n) πρὸς αὐτόν] αυτω 72 C'' 53' n-75 619 646
- 65 (z) τὸν στεναγμόν] των (τον 376) στεναγμων 376 77-οΙ-54 414' z-68 646
- 67 (οΙ) om λαὸν ἐμοί F οΙ C'' 121-392 59 76' Aeth
- 614 (n x) Φαλλούς] φαλους 72 C'-52*-422 106 n-458 x 527 59* 76 646 Syh^{TMg}
- 614 (f x) Ρουβήν 2°] -β(ε)μι 72-381' C'' 118^c 44-610 53'-246 75 730 84 x 18^c 46 59 646'
- 615 (x) om καί 2° 64* C'' 106-125 x 646'
- 616 (Ο) Γεδσών] γηρσων A F M^{mg} 72-426-οΙ-708^c C'-25-54-313-414'-422 85^{mg} 121 76' 646 = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 618 (z) Ἀμράμ] αβρα(α)μ C'-25 54-78 19' 125*-610 628 30 z-128^c 130
- 620 (b z) idem 1° 618^c C'-25 422-78-552 19'-314* 44-610 628 321* 619 z-128^c 130 Sa
- 620 (f x) Ἰωχάβεδ] -βελ 15* C''-52' 78 126 413 552 761 53'-56 x 392 424 Sa
- 620 (z) Ἀμράμ 2°] αβρα(α)μ C'-25 313 422-78-552 19' 44-610 628 343 619 z-128^c 130 Sa
- 75 (Ο s) om εἰμι F 15-135-376'-οΙ C''-(77) s 121 68' 55 59 76' 646 Latcod 100 Syh
- 710 (Ο s) om καί 2° — αὐτοῦ 1° F M 29'-72-135-426-οΙ C'' 44-125 53' s 121 18 59 76' 424 509 646' Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 713 (Ο s) om αὐτοῖς F M Ο''-82' C'' 107' s 121 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 714 (Ο) βεβάρυνται] -ρυνται 29-58' C''-16 126 313' 414' 615 19 125' 53 730^c 318 68' 59 319^c 424 646'
- 715 (ς) ἰδοῦ] pr και C'' 53' 30'-85' 318 128' 424 646 Latcod 100
- 719 (Ο s) om τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου F M 72-426-οΙ-15' C'' s 318 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 724 (n s) ἀπό] εκ F 376 C'' 127-628 85-321^{txt}-343' 370^{txt} 619
- 89 (b) σου 1°] ∩ 2° C'' b 628 646
- 816 (b) χειρί] + (÷ Syh) σου 64^{mg} C''-126 b 458 74 318 424 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh
- 818 (t) ἡδύναντο] εδ. A F 15-64*-426-708 C'-77 413 500-25-52'-54-313' 44' 127 t 121
- 818 (Ο z) σκνίφες] σκνιπες (cvar) Ο-15-29 C'' 44 129 84 619 318-527 z 55^c 59 76 646
- 821 (οΙ n) ἐπαποστέλλω] εἰαπ. A οΙ-707 C'-73-25-54-414'-422 n-628 527 630 799
- 821 (Ο) ὑμῶν] σου Ο'-64^{mg}-15-29-135 C'' 121 68' 55 59 76' 509 Aeth Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 824 (f x) γῆν] pr την B 15-29-72-381-708 C''-126 53'-246 x 318-527 509 646'
- 829 (Ο) ὅδε] ιδου 58'-64^{mg}-135-707 C'' 127^{mg}-628 730 392 646 Latcod 106 Aeth Co Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 829 (οΙ b) σου 1°] ∩ 2° A* οΙ-64^{mg}-29-135 C'' 118'-537 121 55 59 76' 509 Aeth-C
- 93 (οΙ) χεῖρ] pr η οΙ C''-73 413 246 527 509
- 98 (Ο) om λέγων 58' C'' 424 646' Oxf 4(vid) Aeth = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 98 (Ο) πασάτω] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτην Ο-15 C'' 318 verss = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 99 (d x) γῆ] pr τη 72 C''-77 550'-25^c-52'-54-313-422 d-125 53' x
- 910 (n s) τῆς καμιναιας] την καμιν(ι)αιαν C''(-414' 550'^{txt}) 53' n(-75) 30'-85-321^{txt}-343-344^{txt} 646
- 911 (Ο n) ἐγένετο] -νοντο A 58'-376-707 C''(-126) 106 53' 75' 30 84 121 18^(mg) 55 59 76' 130 646'
- 913 (Ο) πρὸς Μωυσην] τω μωση (cvar) 15-72-135-376 C'' 318 59^{txt} 76' 646
- 919 (f) om ἡ C'' f-246 619 120 59 646'
- 920 (Ο) συνήγαγεν] + (※Syh) τους παιδας αυτου (-τω 552; > 72 730) και Ο-15 C'' 730 318 128' 646 Arm Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 926 (οΙ) γῆ] pr τη οΙ C''-(16) 126 318 130 646'
- 928 (Ο b) om περι ἐμοῦ A M^{txt} Ο'-15-135-707 C'' b 121 18 55 76' Aeth-M Pal Syh^{Ltxt} = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 929 (Ο n) Μωυσης] μωσης 15-72-135-426 C-126 664* n
- 929 (οΙ n) οὐκ ἔσται ἔτι] ουκετι (ουκ εστιν 618) εσται οΙ-29 C''-52' 761 458' 84 18 Arm Syh
- 933 (n) ἐκτός] εκ 426 C'' 246 n-628 18
- 103 (Ο n) Μωυσης] μωσης 15-72-135-426 C-500-52'-126-313'-422-550' 107' n 619 646
- 106 (d) om αἱ οἰκίαι 2° C-57'-73 44'-125 Aeth

- 106 (οΙ b) οίκίαι 3°] + αι M οΙ-618-135 C''-16 52 57 126 422 551* 19'-118c-537 246 458 85-344 128' 18 Aeth Arab Bo^B Pal Sa
- 106 (Ο) om Μωνσής A M 72-376-οΙ-82 C''-(54) 126 121 68' 18 55 59 76' 509 Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh = **℞**
- 109 (Ο) ἡμῶν 1°] + (※64 Arm^{ms} Syh) πορευσομεθα 15-58-64^{mg}-376 C'' 318 Arm Syh = **℞**
- 1012 (Ο n) ὄν] ὡν 58' C''-126 414' 422c 550' 56 75-628 318
- 1015 (οΙ b) om οὐδέν οΙ-64^{mg} C''-(126) b 134^{txt} 130 509 799
- 1021 (οΙ) γῆν] γης M οΙ-29 C''-552 761 121 68' 59 319 424
- 1024 (Ο) βοῶν] + (※64 Syh) υμῶν O-72-15-64^{mg}-135 C''-552 318 18 646 Aeth Arab Bo Pal Syh = **℞**
- 1025 (z) ἀλλά] pr ου (ουχι 126) 707 C'' 30'-85^{mg} 121c-527 68'-128' 18c 646 Aeth-G Sa
- 1026 (Ο b) λατρεύσωμεν] -σομεν M 15-29c-58-135-426c-707-οΙ C''-14 54 313' 615* b-19 129 127c 321-730 46-74 318-527 120-128' 18 646
- 1029 (οΙ x) om δέ οΙ C''-126 413 628 x
- 112 (Ο) πλησίον 2°] + (※64 Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτης O-15-64^{mg}-381' C'' 246 46 318 128' 646' verss = **℞**
- 117 (Ο s) om τῶν A O-376-15-135 C''-73 s-321 509
- 118 (f) καταβήσονται] -βοήσονται C''-552 (761) 53'-56* 121 68' 646'
- 122 (Ο x) ἔστιν] ἐσται 58'-381' C''-126 246 x 392 120-128' 59 424 646 Arm
- 129 (Ο s) ἠψημένον] εψ. (cvar) 58c-72-376-381' C'' 19' 44 246 628 s 46 527 18 59 76' 799
- 1210 (Ο) συντρίψετε] συντριβησεται 58'-82*(vid)-707-οΙ C''-413 (761^{txt}) 44* 75 46 122* Arab
- 1219 (Ο s) Ἰσραήλ] pr υἱων 58'-707 C'' 19' 30'-85^{mg} 527 630 76' 646' Arab Bo
- 1221 (b) γερούσιαν] pr την C b 53' 134 527 59 509 799
- 1226 (Ο) fin] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) υμιν (cvar) O-15 C'' 318 Arm Syh = **℞**
- 1229 (Ο b) ἕως πρωτοτόκου παντός] παν (> Bo) πρωτοτοκον A M O'-15-29-135 C'' b 127 85'^{mg} 121-527 68' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 ^{Lat}cod 101 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh = **℞**
- 1237 (d n) Ῥαμεσσή] ραμεση 72-618* C'-25-54*-313-422 19 d 75-628 30'-321 46 318-527 59 76' 130 424 799 Arm
- 1237 (d) Σοκχώθα] οκχωθ 82 cI-25-54-414'-422 44'-107 424 799
- 1242 (οΙ) τῷ κυρίῳ] κῦ οΙ C''-126 131* 106* 75 Bo Syh
- 1248 (οΙ) om πρὸς υἱᾶς οΙ C
- 1311 (s) δῶ] δωσω F 376* C-77-25-54-57-313-414-422-550' 30-85-343' 527 18 424
- 1315 (οΙ) ἐγὼ θύω] tr οΙ C'' 799
- 1318 (Ο) om τήν 3° O C''-25 = **℞**
- 1319 (b) μεθ' αὐτοῦ] μετ αὐτου 58 C'' b 424
- 146 (οΙ γ) οὖν] δε οΙ-82' C'' 53 γ-318 68' Aeth Arm Sa
- 149 (Ο f) ἱππεῖς] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτου 15-72-426-707 C'' f-56c1 129 318 Arm Co Syh = **℞**
- 149 (x) στρατιά] -τεια F 29-72-82 C'-550'-25-54-313-414-422-615* 56-129 75 30' x 121' 68' 799
- 1412 (Ο z) πρὸς σέ / ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ] tr M 82-426-οΙ C''-25 552 108 127 30' 392-527 z-128 18 46 130 424 799
- 1417 (d) καὶ 6°] ∩ (18) 2° 54-500-cI d-44 68-120 55 799 Arab Syh^T
- 1421 (x) om ἐν 58-618* C-131^{mg} 75 74 x 392 55 76' 130 799
- 1521 (n s) αὐτῶν] αὐταις 707(vid) C''-57^{mg} 126 246 n-75 85'-343' 59 130 646 Syh
- 1526 (Ο) φυλάξης] -ξη (-ξει 46* 319) F M 72-οΙ C''-(54) 126 18 46 55 76' 646
- 165 (Ο) om καὶ 2° 58' C'' 125 53' 646 Aeth Arm Pal
- 168 (d t) ἀλλ' ἢ] ἀλλα 376 C'' d 53 75 321^{mg} t 799
- 1620 (s) αὐτοῖς] αὐτους Fb 376 C'' 458 s 121-392 68' 55 646
- 1633 (οΙ) om τό οΙ-707 C'' 127 424
- 173 (οΙ) ἔκει / ὁ λαός] tr οΙ C''-551 19' 127 392 46 424 509 ^{Lat}cod 104
- 173 (οΙ) om τοῦτο οΙ C'' 424 Aeth Arm Bo^A
- 176 (n s) ἐλθεῖν] + ἐκει 376* C'' n-127 s-343' 121^{mg} 628
- 178 (οΙ) ἐπολέμει] -μησεν οΙ C''-(54) Sa
- 1711 (οΙ t) ἐγένετο] ἐγιν. A B F Fb οΙ-707 C'-552 739-25-54-414'-422 127 130^{mg} t 55 76' 646 Arm
- 1712 (Ο b) ἐπ'] επανω 376-οΙ C'' b 730 121 646

- 1714 (n) ὑπὸ τόν] υπ 381' C'-126-422 53 n⁻¹²⁷ 30' 619 527 128 76' 646'
 1715 (O x) om κυρίω A F M O'-58-15-29-707^{txt} C'' x 121' 18 46^c 59 76' 509 Arab Bo Syh
 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 184 (oI) om τό oI-82 C''-761 85 392-527
 189 (f) Αἰγυπτίων] pr των A M C''-(126) 414* 107' 56'-129 121-392 68' 18 46 76 646(mg) 799
 1812 (s) παρεγένετο] -νοντο 72-707 cI' 75 30'-85'mg-130mg 646 Latcod 104 Arm
 1818 (O) om ἀνυπομονήτω A* F 58-oI-64mg C''-(551) 121 68' 59 646 Aeth Arab = $\mathfrak{M}$
 1822 (O b) κουφιοῦσιν] -φισουσιν A 58'-707-708 C''-126 b
 1823 (O) ἑαυτοῦ τόπον] tr 15-426-oI cI'-73 413 551 646
 1827 (O t) ἑαυτοῦ γαμβρόν] γ. αυτου F 58'-426*-oI'-82' C''-414' 552* et c2 739c 19' 106* 85 t 121
 68 46 55 509 646 Latcod 104 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 193 (f) om καί 3° C''-126 53'-56^c 424 646
 196 (n) om καί C'' n⁻¹²⁷ 46 76' Petr I 29 Aeth-C Sa²
 1914 (O b) ἱμάτια] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) αυτων F^b 15-72-376-707 C'' b 527 59 Aeth Arab Arm
 Bo Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 1918 (d x) αὐτό] αυτω C'-550* 19' d 246 370* x
 1920 (O) om τό 2° A F 58'-381'-707 C-57-126^s-414' 106-125 53'
 2010 (O) ὁ 2°] pr και 15-72-376 C''-413 134 646
 2020 (f) ὑμᾶς 2°] ημας C''-16^c 25 52' 126 761 53'-246 75 730 318 46 59
 2025 (x) αὐτό] αυτω 376-707 C''-52 77 126 739 537 30 x 46* 55* 76* 319
 2026 (oI f) ἀποκαλύψης] ανακαλυψης (-ψις 246) oI C'' f-56* 127
 213 (oI) εἰν 1°] + δε oI C'' 19' 53' 127 121' 424 646 Sa
 213 (oI) ἐξελεύσεται 2°] συνεξ. oI C''-414' 130mg-321mg 318' 424 646
 2112 (s) om θανάτω C'' 85^{txt}-130^{txt}-343-344^{txt} 646 Arab
 2116 (s) τελευτάτω] θανατουσθω C''-(14 422) 246 s(-343) 59 424* 509
 2130 (O) ὅσα] pr (+ και 72; ※Arm^{mss} Syh) κατα παντα 15-72-376 C''-126 646 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2135 (O n) πλησίον] + (※Syh^L) αυτου O-58-15 C'' n⁻¹²⁷ 318 646 Latcod 100 Arm Bo Syh
 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 223 (s) ἐπ'] εν C''-131 s 646
 225 (O n) τά 1°] pr η M 58-707-767 C'' n⁻⁷⁵ 30' 318 18 46 59 646
 228 (O) μὴ αὐτός] tr 15'-72-oI C'' 646
 2219 (n) ἀποκτενεῖτε] αποθανειται (-τε 14-131-739) C-78 106 n⁻¹²⁷ 18 76' = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2220 (oI n) om ὁ oI C''-126 n 59 646 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2225 (O z) παρὰ σοί] pr (+ ÷ Syh^L) τω M 15-29-72-376-oI-64* C''-54 127^c 392 68'-120' 18
 46 55 76' 424 Co Syh
 2226 (f) ἐνεχυράσης] -ριασης (aut -σεις) 708*-767^c C''-78 56^c-129-246
 231 (oI) συγκαταθήσῃ] -καθισεις (cvar) oI C'' 646
 2318 (s) θύσεις] θυμιασεις A* C'' 44 30'-85-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-343' 68'
 2318 (f x) θυσιάσματος] θυμιαματος A^c B C''-422 19' f-246 30'-130* x 646'
 2322 (oI b) om ἀκοῇ A F M oI-29 C''-131^c b 125 56* 458 318 68' 46 59 424 509 Aeth Syh
 2324 (O f) καθελεῖς] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) αυτους 15-72-376 C'' f-56* 318 128'-628 426 646 Aeth
 Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2327 (O f) φόβον] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) μου F^b O-58-15 C''-551 f-56* 318 424 646 Arab Arm Bo^B
 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2327 (f) εἰσπορεύῃ] εκπορ. 58 C''-54 f 407 55 424
 2328 (s) fin] + (cvar) και (+ τους s Bo) φερεζαιους και τους γεργεσαιους και τους ιεβουσαιους
 C''-77 246 s 646 Bo
 2329 (O f) αὐτούς] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) απο προσωπου σου O-58-15 C'' f-56^{txt} 318 646 Arab
 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2330 (O d) om μικρόν 2° B O-376-82 C'' d 30' 646 Latcodd 91 94 95 Aeth
 2331 (x) χαλάσσης 1°] ∩ 2° A* 29 C'-131^c-52'-313'-422 x 68' 76' 646'
 241 (s) κύριον] με 82'-376 C''-131^c 127^c s 527 424 646 Latcod 102
 244 (n s) λίθους] + εστησεν C'' 19' 246 n⁻⁷⁵ s 628-630 18 646 Arm
 2416 (y) αὐτό] αυτον C''-54 57* 126 413 414' 125 458 84 y⁻³⁹²
 258 (oI) om πάντων 64^{txt}-381' C''-131^c 424 646
 259 (O) πλάτος] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) αυτης O-58-15 C'' 318 424 Aeth Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 259 (O) ὕψος] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) αυτης 15-376-767 C'' 318 424 646 Aeth Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

- 2511 (οΙ) δεύτερον] ετερον οΙ C^{~131c} 646 Arm
 2512 (οΙ) ποιήσεις δέ] και ποιησεις F^b οΙ C[~]
 2518 (x z) ποιηθήσονται] + δε M 29 C[~] x 68'-128'-628 18 46 426 509 646
 2522 (Ο) ὕψος] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτης Ο-58-15 C[~] 318 646 Arm Syh = ㄹ
 2531 (Ο b) om της λυχνίας 2° A 58'-οΙ C[~] b 646 Latcodd 100 102 103 Aeth
 261 (οΙ) om ἐκ οΙ C^{~131c} 424 = ㄹ
 263 (b) om δέ C^{~131c} 118'-537 246 126 424 Latcod 102 Aeth Arm Syh = ㄹ
 265 (d) ποιήσεις 1°] ∩ 2° C^{~131c}-422 107'-125 53-246 30 126 Latcod 103
 2613 (y) τούτου 1°] ∩ 2° 29-767 C^{~131c}-25 y⁻⁵²⁷ 128-628 509 Latcod 96 Aeth Bo^{AeB}
 2623 (οΙ)γωνιών] pr δυο οΙ C^{~16} 552^{txt}
 2627 (s) στύλω 1°] pr ενι C^{~761} 246 30'-85-343'
 2635 (b n) μέρους 1°] μερος 707-767 C^{~131c}-52 b n
 271 (s) om τό 2° A F M 29-64'-72-82 C^{~77} 552-54-313-422 56 s 318 126 18 46 55 59 509 799
 = ㄹ
 2711 (οΙ b) εἴκοσι 1°] + χαλκοι οΙ C^{~(25)} 73* 761 b Arm
 2712 (οΙ) στῦλοι] pr οι οΙ C^{~739}
 2716 (x) κεκλωσμένου] νενησμ. (cvar) F^b C x
 2719 (Ο) κατασκευή] + της σκηνης F^b Ο C[~] 318 Latcodd 91 94-96 Arab Arm Syh = ㄹ
 2720 (f x) om σύ 72-381' C^{~131c} 106 f⁻¹²⁹ 458 130^{txt}-321^{txt}-344* x 59 424 426 Bo
 2720 (x z) om σοι 707 C[~] x 318 z 424 Aeth Bo^A
 281 (s) μοι] εμοι C[~] 127 s⁻⁸⁵ 74
 2811 (s) τοῖς ὀνόμασιν] των ωμων της επωμιδος cI^{mg-78} 85'^{mg}-130^{mg}-344^{mg} 424^{mg}
 2820 (Ο x) χρυσίφ 1°] ∩ 2° F^b 15-58' C[~] 53' 458 71' 126 = ㄹ
 [2824] (s) πρὸς τὰ ἄκρα] επι το ακρον C[~] s 630 646
 [2827] (s) om δύο 1° C^{~131c} s 630 18^{txt} 646
 2823 (Ο z) θεοῦ] + (※Arm^{ms}) δια παντος F^b Ο C[~] 246 318 126-128'-628 646 Aeth^C Arm Syh
 = ㄹ
 2831 (x) ἄγιον] λογιον C[~] 71'
 2835 (s) κόσμυβοι] κοσσυ(μ)βοι 82' C^{~16} 25 78 761 30'-130-344^c 628 59
 2839 (οΙ) ἦ] + και οΙ-15 C[~]-25-54-414-422 128'-628 646
 291 (n) ἔν] ενα 58*-72 C 44 n⁻¹²⁷
 2911 (οΙ b) om τοῦ μαρτυρίου οΙ-15 C^{~52} (54) 500 b 319 646'
 2912 (z) θήσεις] επιθ. M C[~] 246 318 z 18 59
 2914 (Ο) δέρμα] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτου F^b Ο-58 C[~] 318 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = ㄹ
 2914 (Ο) κόπρον] + (※Syh) αυτου Ο-58 C[~] 318 646 Aeth Arab Bo Syh = ㄹ
 2914 (οΙ) om πυρί οΙ-15 C^{~131c} 55 646 Aeth^C Arm
 2916 (Ο) αἶμα] + (※Syh) αυτου Ο C[~] 318 319 Aeth Arab Arm Syh = ㄹ
 2917 (Ο) ἐνδόσθια] + (※Syh) αυτου Ο-58 C[~] 318 Arab Bo Syh = ㄹ
 2917 (Ο) fin] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτου 15-72-376 C[~] 318 646 Arm Syh = ㄹ
 2919 (x) om αὐτῶν C[~] 71' 426 646
 2934 (s) τὰ λοιπά] πυρί] tr 707 C[~] s 646 Aeth
 2938 (Ο) ἐνιαυσίους] -σαιοys 58'-707-708 C[~] 129*(vid) 730 318 424 426
 304 (s) αὐτό] αυτα C[~] s 646 Aeth^C
 3014 (n) om εἰς 707 C[~] n 392 55 426 646 Latcod 100
 3016 (οΙ n) μνημόσυνον] pr εις οΙ C[~] n⁻¹²⁷ 646 = ㄹ
 3016 (s) ὑμῶν] αυτων C[~] 30'-85'-130-344*(cprm) 646 Aeth Arab Arm
 3020 (x) πρὸς] εις C[~] 71' 646 Arm
 3020 (οΙ s) ὀλοκαντώματα] -καρπωματα F οΙ-618 C^{~16} 25 52 500 761 30'-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321'^{txt}-343-344^{txt} 59 646 Syh
 3021 (Ο) χεῖρας] + (※Syh) αυτων F^b 58-376 C[~] 318 Aeth Bo Syh = ㄹ
 3021 (Ο b) πόδας] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αυτων F^b 58-376 C^{~73} b 646 Aeth Arm Bo Syh = ㄹ
 3023 (n x) καὶ 3°] ∩ (24)1° A* B* 14-761-cl 19 n⁻¹²⁷ 30-343-344^{txt} 71' 318 18 426
 3031 (οΙ) ἄλειμμα] χρισμα οΙ C[~] 392 646
 3032 (f) ποιήσεται] ποιηθησεται B 15' C[~] f⁻¹²⁹ 30' 646'
 3035 (s) μυρεψοῦ] pr συνθεσεως 767 C[~] 127 s 646
 312 (n s) ἀνακέκλημαι] -ληκα 707-767 C^{~413} n 30'-85^{txt}-130-321'^{txt}-343' 527 424 646
 313 (s) ἐν] pr (※Syh^L) και 376 C[~] 30'-85-343' 646 Syh = ㄹ

- 316 (Ο) δέδωκα 2°] *εδωκα* 58'-64*-707^I C''-414'
- 318 (οΙ) τὰ θυσιαστήρια] *το θυσιαστηριον οΙ* C'' 646 Aeth Bo
- 3114 (n s) ἐν αὐτῷ | ἔργον] tr 767 C'' n-75 s 426 646 Latcod 100
- 3114 (n) om μέσου F^b 15' C' 56' n 799 Aeth Arab Bo
- 3117 (f s) om ἐν 1° 58 C'' f-129 s 392 426 646' Aeth Sa
- 321 (s) ἀνάστηθι] *αναστα* C'' s 646
- 323 (x) αὐτῶν] *των γυναικων αυτων (> 426) και των θυγατερων αυτων (> 71' La)* C 71' 426 Latcod 100 Sa
- 324 (n s) ἐκ γῆς] *εξ* 767 C'' n 85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321'^{txt}-343' Latcod 104
- 327 (b s) κατάρβηθι] pr και C''-25 550' 761 118'-537 s 646
- 3219 (s) τῇ] pr εν C'' 537 s 318 424 646'
- 3226 (s) εἶπεν] *λεγει* 767 C'' 127 30'-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321'-343'-346^{txt} 318 646
- 3231 (s) ἐπέστρεψεν δέ] *και απεστραφη* 767 C'-551-57' 127 30'-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321'^{txt}-343'
- 3234 (Ο) προπορεύσεται] -*ρευεται* B 15-72-οΙ C-77 19 56-129 130 318' 319 Syh
- 332 (n s) Γεργεσαῖον — fin] (cvar) *τον ευαιον και τον ιεβουσαιον και τον χαναναιον και τον γεργεσαιον* 767 C'-57' n s 318 646 Latcodd 100 104
- 337 (n s) τὴν σκηνὴν αὐτοῦ | ἔπηξεν] tr 767 C'-57' n s 646
- 337 (d z) παρεμβολῆς 1°] $\cap$ 2° B* 29-72 C-131^{mg}-25^{txt}-761 107'-125 134 68'-120' 46 319 646 Bo
- 3313 (s) σου 3°] + *ουτος* C'-57' 30'-85-130^c-321'-344* Arm
- 3412 (s) θῆς] *διαθης* C''-54 78 414' 85-130-321' 527
- 3413 (Ο n) συντρίψετε] -*ψατε* O-767 C-77^c-761^c 246* n-127 130* 318 407 55* 319 426 509 799
- 3421 (s) καταπαύσεις 1°] *αναπαυση* C'' 30'-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321'^{txt}-343'
- 3421 (οΙ s) idem 2°] -*σις* B F M' οΙ-15'-707* C''-551 44 53' 127 s-30' 392 68^c 18 Latcod 103 Syh
- 3423 (Ο) θεοῦ] + σου F M' 767-οΙ C''-414' 44 129-246 85^{txt}-343' 527 121 18 55 59 426 509 Sa^{ap}
- 3424 (s) ἐμπλατύνω] *εκπλ.* 707* C''-16 73 30-85^{txt}-130^{txt}-321'-343'-346^{txt}*
- 3424 (s) ἀναβαίνης] *αναβης* C'' s 59 509
- 3426 (s x) om κυρίου 64* C''-78 s 71' Latcod 100
- 3427 (s) τά] pr παντα 376 C'' s 424
- 3428 (s) ἔναντι] *εναντιον* B 707 C'' 75 s-130 527
- 3429 (s γ) om δύο A F M' 29 C'' s γ-318 68' 18 46 59 319 509
- 3429 (s) om αὐτοῦ 1° C''-761 85-130-321' 59
- 3431 (s) αὐτοῦς | Μωυσῆς] tr C'' 53' 85-130-321'
- 3433 (s) ἐπέθηκεν] *εθηκεν* C'' s 121
- 3434 (b) δ' ἄν] *δε* 376 C b
- 3435 (Ο s) δεδόξασται] + (※ 344; cvar) *η οψις του χρωτος (om τ. χρ. C'' 85-130-321') του προσωπου αυτου* O-58 C'' 85-130-321'-344^{mg} 318 Arab(vid) Arm Syh
- 352 (n s) κυρίῳ] *πῶ* 767 C''-54 414' n 30-85-130-321'-343-344^{txt} Latcod 100 Aeth
- 357 (n s) fin] + (cvar) *και ελαιον της χρισεως και το θυμαμα της συνθεσεως* C''-131^{mg} n-127 85-130-321'
- 3516 (d x) om comma C''-25 54 107'-125 53-56^{txt} 130 71' 318 55 59
- 3522 (s) ἐνώτια] et *δακτυλίους* tr C'' s-30'
- 3523 (n s) βύσσοις] + *παρ αυτω (αυτων 75' 416)* F^a F^b M' 707 C'' n s 18
- 3524 (s x) κυρίῳ] pr τω M' C''-77 (739) 129 s 71' 18
- 3529 (s) εἰσελθόντας] -*λθειν* C'' s Syh
- 3529 (s) om πάντα C'' s 55
- 3530 (s x) ὁ θεός] *κς* C'' s 71' 55 424 Latcod 103 = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3535 (f) ποικιλίας] pr και C'-422 f-129 Syh
- 361 (s) σοφία καὶ ἐπιστήμη] *επ. σοφιας και συνεσεως* C'' s
- 363 (f) τό] τω 29-64*-707 cI-25-313-615 107' f-129 75
- 3611 (s) ἐαυτό] *εαυτα* F^b M^{mg} C'' 75^c-127 30'-85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343'
- 3612 (s) αὐτοῦ 2°] *εαυτου* C'' 19' 56' s 799
- 3623 (n) χρυσοῦς] $\cap$ (24) 767 C'-422 246 n-127^{mg} 527 628-630 59 424 Latcod 104
- 3625 (n s) τὰ ἐμπλόκια] *το εμπλοκιον* C'' 19' n s-30' 424 Latcod 100
- 3633 (s) ἐπέθηκεν] *υπεθ.* C-25-52^{cpr}-57'-78-313-422-550-615 s 424

- 375 (s) *νενησμένου*] *διανεν*. 82 C''-(73^{txt}) 500 s 84*
- 376 (s) *κεφαλίδας*] *-λας* A C'' s
- 379 (d) *αὐτῶν* 1°] $\cap$ 2° C'' d
- 3720 (O) *Οὐρί*] + *νιου* (cvar) *ωρ* F^h O C'' 85'-130 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3720 (s) *ἐποίησαν*] *-σαν* C'' s Aeth^{FH}
- 385 (s) *ἄνωθεν*] *pr* *της κιβωτου* C'' s 424
- 3816 (f s) *ἐνθέμια*] *ανθ*. F^{avid} M^{mg} G-58-707(mg) C''(-552) 19' f-129 127* s 527 318 128 Lat^{codd}
91 94—96 100
- 396 (O f) *ἐποίησαν*] *-σεν* F^h M'^{mg} O C'' 19' f-129 318 59 799 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 398 (s) *τῆς* 1°] $\cap$ 2° 707-767 C'' s
- 3913 (f) *αὐταῖς*] *αὐτοῖς* C''-54 414' f-129
- 405 (s) *ἐπί*] *εις* C''(-552) 30'-85-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-343' 646
- 4013 (oI' s) *ἱερατεύσουσίν*] *-σωσιν* 381'-oII⁻⁷⁰⁷ C'-77-25-52'-313-422 246* s-85 619 318 46 55
319 509
- 4015 (s) *ἐξ*] *εκ γης* (της 707) 707 C'' s 424 646 Aeth^{CR} Arm Bo
- 4023 (f s) *ἐπέθηκεν*] *εθηκεν* C'' 53'-129 30'-85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343' 126
- 4024 (d s) *ἐν τῇ σκηνῇ*] *εις την σκηνην* C'' 107'-125 s 319 646
- 4032 (x) *αὐτῆς*] *αυτην* A*(vid) C''-25 413 71' 318 46 646
- 4032 (O) *Ἰσραήλ*] *pr* *οικου* O C'' 85'-130 46 Arm^{ap} Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

The following table indicates the number of times each group shares a variant reading with the Catena text. Column A gives the number of instances for a single group following a Catena variant, whereas Column B shows two groups supporting such variants.

	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>Total</i>
O	44	46	90
oI	31	14	45
oI'	—	5	5
oII	—	—	—
b	8	18	26
d	5	9	14
f	11	15	26
n	10	32	42
s	54	40	94
t	1	4	5
x	12	21	33
y	2	2	4
z	6	9	15

In ranked order the support in totals is: s 94; O 90; oI 45; n 42; x 33; f, b 26 each; z 15; d 14; t, oI' 5 each; y 4, and oII 0. As in Genesis the Catena text has clearly been strongly influenced by the hexaplaric text; this is also reflected in the number of instances in the list where the variant equals $\mathfrak{M}$ (58 cases). The Catena text is closely related to the s group; in fact s stands at the head of the list. The subgroup oI (to which the five instances of oI' may be added) supports C variants 50 times according to the table, but its support is far stronger since many of the instan-

ces attributed to *O* include *oI* as part of the witnesses for *O*; in fact readings supported by all *oI* mss plus one *O* ms have been classified as *O* in the table.

Other support is not overly significant. Byzantine support is very weak, though *n* does yield 42 instances, whereas the major Byzantine groups, *d t* have only 14 and 5 resp.

It should also be noted that ms 646 often supports the Catena text; in fact it does so 117 times in the list even though it is extant for only about two-thirds of the Exodus text. It is indeed a Catena ms, but though its text is strongly influenced by the *C* text it remains a mixed text and should not be included as a member of the *C* text family.

Chapter IV: The Texts of A and B

Unfortunately Exodus papyri remains older than the text of B are merely bits and pieces; no complete verse obtains among them — in fact, many are so fragmentary that only a few letters per line are extant. This situation makes our oldest mss, B and A from the 4th and 5th Centuries resp., particularly important for the restoration of the text of Exod, and this study is an attempt to show the importance of these texts as well as their place in the text history of Greek Exodus. The only other Codex which is as old as B and/or A is G whose text is extant for only a small part of the last chapters of the book. Its text is an excellent example of the O recension and its readings are discussed in Chapter I.

A. The text of B as the older ms is discussed first. *List 1* contains all readings of B which are unique to it. The list naturally does not contain readings of B^c unless they are specifically designated as *prima manus*.

List 1

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>314 Μωυσην] + λεγων B
 322 σκυλεύετε] -σατε B
 414 Λευίτης] λευειτης B
 418 ει] η B*
 423 ἀποκτενω] -κτενω B
 428 σημεία] ρηματα B
 522 om διά B
 615 Ἰεμουήλ] ιεμιήλ B
 719 σου 2°] + εν τη χειρι σου B
 722 ἐσκληρύνθη] -ρυνεν B
 88 τὸν λαόν] αυτους B
 826 οὕτως] + μα αυτο B*. For ρημα
 τουτο? cf 956
 829 ἡ κυνόμενία / ἀπό σου] tr B
 916 μου 2°] ου B*
 919 ἄν εὔρεθῃ] σοι εστιν B
 929 om πρὸς κύριον B
 933 ἔτι] ουκετι B
 1013 om κύριος B*
 1015 om πάση B*
 1019 ἐνέβαλεν] εβαλεν B
 1026 οὐχ] ουκ B*
 117 om ἀπὸ ἀνθρώπου ἕως κτήνους B^{ext}
 1214 αὕτη ὑμῖν] tr B
 1240 τριάκοντα] + πεντε B*
 1241 τριάκοντα] + πεντε B*
 1314 ἡμᾶς κύριος] tr B
 1318 om ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου B*
 1322 παντός / τοῦ λαοῦ] tr B
 149 om Φαραώ B*
 1420 om τῆς παρεμβολῆς 1° B</p> | <p>1517 κατειργάσω] κατηρτισω B
 1523 τό] τουτο B*
 1621 om πρωί 2° — αὐτῷ B
 1623 Μωυσῆς] κς B
 1623 τοῦτο] pr ου B*
 1713 μαχαίρας] -ρης B
 1714 Ἰησοῦ] ιησοι B
 188 τοῖς] pr πασι B
 1813 ἐσπέρας] δειλης B
 1823 ἥξει] ad fin tr B
 1912 Σινά] σεينا B*
 192 ἐξῆραν] απηραν B
 1911 16 23 Σινά] σεينا B*
 2135 κερατίση] + τις B*
 227 διπλοῦν] pr το B
 229 om τῷ πλησίον B*
 2230 ἀποδώσεις] -ση B
 232 ἐκκλῖναι 2°] εκκλεισαι B
 235 συνεγερεῖς] συναρεις B*
 2311 ἀνήσεις] ανεσεις B*
 2517 χρυσᾶ τορευτά] χρυσοτορ. B*
 2522 τράπεζαν] + χρυσην B
 2525 τέσσαρας] -ρες B*
 2540 ὄρα] ολα B*
 2625 σὺλῳ τῷ ἐνί 1°] ενι στυλω B
 2633 τοὺς στύλους] των στυλων B*
 274 ἐπὶ] υπο B*
 2712 om τό 2° B*
 2719 ἐργαλεῖα] αργαλια B
 2720 καίηται] καηται B
 2821 τὰς δώδεκα] δεκα δυο B</p> |
|---|--|

2835 κόσυμβοι] -μβωτοι B
 2835 χιτώνων] κίτωνων B
 291 λήμψη] + δε B
 2911 ἔναντι] -ντιον B*
 2926 ἀφόρισμα] αφαιρισμα B*
 2937 καθαριεῖς] -ριει B*
 307 θυμιάσει 1°] θυσει B*
 307 τούς λύχνους] ο λυχνος B*
 3010 ἐξιλιάσεται] + περι αυτου B*
 3010 om τῶν 2° — ἐνιαυτοῦ 2° B: homoiot
 3010 om τάς B
 3016 ἐξιλιάσασθαι] pr και B*
 3113 ἔστιν γὰρ σημεῖον] σημ. εστιν B
 3118 Σινά] σεينا B*
 3213 τῷ σπέρματι αὐτῶν] αυτοις B
 3233 om ἐνώπιόν μου B*
 3233 αὐτόν] αυτους B
 3234 νυνί] συ B*
 335 om τῶν δοξῶν B*
 3418 om τῷ B
 3419 πρωτότοκον 1°] pr παν B
 3432 ἐλάλησεν] ενετειλατο B
 3432 Σινά] σεينا B
 351 om πρὸς αὐτούς B
 356 om καί 1° B
 3521 ἤνεγκαν 1°] ἀνηνεγκαν B*

3524 ἀργύριον καὶ χαλκόν / ἤνεγκαν] tr B
 3531 om θεῖον B*
 361 om κύριος B*(vid)
 365 παρὰ] κατα B
 3628 ἐπωμίδος 1°] ∩ 2° B
 3636 βύσσου 2°] ∩ 3° B^{txt}
 375 χερουβίμ] του χερουβειμ B
 379 ἐφ'] επ B
 3719 Λευιτῶν] λευειτων B*
 386 om χρυσοῦς — (7) χερουβ 2° B^{txt}:
 homoiot
 3816 ἐπ' 2°] απ B*
 3816 om τῆς B
 3821 πασσάλους 1°] ∩ 2° B
 3824 τὸ θυσιαστήριον / ἐν αὐτοῖς] tr B
 3826 κατόπτρων] κατω πρω B*
 391 om ὁ B*
 398 αὐτοῦ] αυτων B*
 399 αὐλῆς 1°] πυλῆς B
 3921 ἐργαλεῖα 1° 2°] αργαλ(ε)ια B
 3921 εἰς τὰ] εριστα B
 403 κιβωτόν 2°] + του μαρτυριου B
 4011 om καί 4° B*
 4025 ἐθυμιάσεν] εθυσιασεν B*
 4030 ἡ νεφέλη] post σκηπῆς tr B

An analysis of these unique readings is most interesting. The ms is heavily itacistic in often having *ει* for *ι*; these are at 414 191 211 16 23 3118 3432 375 19. It also betrays occasional failure to recognize aspiration, shown by the occurrence of *κ* for *χ*, but also of *π* for *φ* (1026 2835 379). Late or Hellenistic forms occur at 1713 *μαχαιρης* and *αργαλ(ε)ια* at 2719 3921(twice), but an unexpected Attic form *καηται* instead of *καίηται* occurs at 2720. Somewhat puzzling is 423 *αποκτενω* in a context clearly future; the form represents a variant spelling for the present stem elsewhere throughout. At 2311 B alone has the old (Homeric) spelling for the future of *ἀνίημι* (*ανεσεις*). Other changes in verbal inflection obtain at 322 722 2230 2937. Changes in nominal inflection occur at 3233 398 for number, and at 2525 2633 307 for case, and in an adjectival phrase at 2625. Transposition of words or phrases are found at 829 1214 1314 22 1823 3113 3524 3824 4030. Changes in prepositions occur at 274 2911 365 3816.

Omissions (28 cases) are often due to homoioteleuton; other cases never involve more than a few words and usually no more than two. There are also 16 cases of additions: of an article at 227 375, of a conjunction at 291 3016, of a pronoun 2135, an adjective 2522, of a form of *πᾶς* 188 3419, of *πεντε* 1240 41, a negative particle 1623, a noun 403, a prepositional phrase 719 3010, and of *λεγων* 314. Change of compound to simplex is recorded at 1019, of the reverse at 3521 and of prepositional element in a compound at 192.

Of more interest are changes involving lexemes. These may involve synonyms such as 428 *ρηματα* (for *σημεῖα*), 3432 *ενετειλατο* (*ἐλάλησεν*), 1813 *δειλης* (*ἐσπέρας*), 2821 *δεκα δυο* (*τὰς δώδεκα*), 2926 *αφαιρισμα* (*ἀφόρισμα*), 307 *θυσει* (*θυμιάσει*), and 4025 *εθυσιασεν* (*ἐθυμιάσεν*); cf also 933 *ουκετι* (*ἔτι*) after an *οὐκ* construction, and

25¹⁷ χρυσοτορευτα (for χρυσᾶ τορευτά). Other semantic changes are 8⁸ αὐτους (τὸν λαόν), 9¹⁹ σοι εστιν (ἄν εὔρεθῃ), 15¹⁷ κατηρτισω (κατειργάσω), 15²³ τουτο (τό), 16²³ κς (Μωυσῆς), 23² ἐκκλῆσαι (ἐκκλῖναι), 23⁵ συναρεις (συνεγερεῖς), 28³⁵ κοσυμβωτοι (κόσυμβοι), 32¹³ αυτοις (τῷ σπέρματι αὐτῶν), 32³⁴ συ (νυνί), and 39⁹ πυλης (αὐλῆς). Only two unique spellings of proper nouns obtain in B (aside from itacisms): 6¹⁵ ἱε-μῖηλ (Ἰεμουήλ), and 17¹⁴ ἱησοι (Ἰησοῦ); for the latter cf Sect. K in Chapter VII. Palaeographically inspired are the errors at 8²⁶ 9¹⁶ 25⁴⁰ 38²⁶ 39²¹.

In order to give a somewhat fuller picture of the character of B, a second list of readings is given below in which B is not unique but is accompanied by no more than five scattered witnesses for a reading.

List 2

- 2¹ Λενί 1°] λενει B* M 15-707 Sa
 2¹ Λενί 2°] λενει B* M 15-707 Ach Sa
 2¹ καί 1°] (2)1° B Aeth^{CG} Arab Arm Bo
 2¹⁸ τί ὅτι] δια τι B 15' 392 Epiph I 367 Syh
 3⁸ Εὐαίων] et Γεργεσαίων tr B 72 Aeth^C
 4⁵ om κύριος B 458
 4⁷ εἰσένεγκε] -γκον B 82 130 Or IV 462
 5¹¹ om ὑμεῖς B* Lat^{cod} 100
 6⁸ εἰσάξω] εἰσάξω B* 59 799
 6¹⁶ Λενί 1°] λενει B 707 Ach(vid) Sa
 6¹⁶ Λενί 2°] λενει B M 707 Ach Sa
 6¹⁸ Ἰσαάρ] ἰσσαχαρ B 55
 6¹⁸ Ὀζιήλ] οἰζειλ B* Ach Sa
 6¹⁹ Λενί] λενει B M 707 Sa
 6²⁰ Ἀμράμ 2°] ἀμβραν B 75*-458 76
 6²² Ὀζιήλ] οἰζειλ B Ach Sa
 6²³ Ἀμιναδάβ] ἀμειναδαβ B 120' Procop 544 Ach Sa
 6²³ Ἀβισούδ] pr τον B 59 = 2R
 6²⁵ Λενιτῶν] λενειτων B 835(vid) 707 Ach Sa
 7⁷ om ἦν 2° B 126 107'
 7⁹ om αὐτήν B 53' = 2R
 7¹³ ἐλάλησεν] ενετειλατο B Or Sel 281(1°)
 7²⁴ ὕδωρ 1°] + απο του ποταμου B* 527 55 646 Syh^T
 8⁸ κυρίῳ] pr τω B 129 74 527 799
 8¹⁷ om ἐν 3° — fin B* 458
 8²⁴ κυνομνίας] -μνιης B 82'
 8²⁷ om κυρίῳ B 56*
 8²⁸ om κυρίῳ B 619
 9¹⁴ ἵνα] ιν B 82'
 9³³ ἐξεπέτασεν] εξετεινεν B 82
 10⁸ om κυρίῳ B 82 56-129 Cyr Ad 201^{RV} Sa
 10¹⁵ οὐχ] ουκ B* 82
 10¹⁵ om τοῦ B 82'
 10¹⁹ οὐχ] ουκ B* 56
 10²³ ἦν φῶς] tr B 527 Phil III 230^{te} Arm Pal
 10²⁶ ὑπολειψόμεθα] υπολ(ε)ιφθησομεθα B 707^s
 11⁸ om πᾶς B* Aeth Arab Bo
 11¹⁰ ἠθέλησεν] εισηκουσεν B 82 120-128'
 12⁴ ἱκανοὺς εἶναι] tr B 19' Lat^{Aug} Loc in hept II 63 PsCyp Pasch 1
 12¹⁰ ἀπολείπετε] -λημεται (-λιψ. B) B 58 122*
 12¹² διελεύσομαι] ελενσομαι B Aeth(vid)

- 1226 om οἱ B 246 75 318 319
 1230 om πάντες 1° B 128' ^{Lat}cod 104 Arab Sa
 1236 κύριος ἔδωκεν] tr B 707 Aeth Arab Arm
 1244 om τινός B 708 Aeth Sa
 135 om δοῦναί σοι B* 618* 392
 1310 om κατὰ καιροὺς ὥρων B Arab
 1315 θύω] + παν πρωτοτοκον B Arab
 1317 οὐχ] ουκ B* 72-82-426 551*
 1319 om Ἰωσήφ 2° B* Aeth = $\mathfrak{M}$
 1322 ἐξέλιπεν] + δε B Bo
 145 τῶν 2°] pr η καρδια B 121 68' Sa
 1416 τὴν ῥάβδον] τη ραβδω B 129
 154 κατεπόντισεν] -ποθησαν B 82 Eus II 828 Pal Sa Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 1517 κύριε 1°] $\bigcap$ 2° B^{xt} ^{Lat}Cant^R
 1522 1625 οὐχ] ουκ B* 82
 1523 ἐπωνομάσθη] -μασεν B 319 Cyr Ad 380 Gl 444 Arm Syh
 1524 Μωσῆν] μωσην B 18
 1526 κύριος] + ο θς σου B 30 Bo
 161 Σινά] σεينا B* 707*
 168 ὁ γογγυσμὸς ὑμῶν / ἐστιν] tr B Anast 652 1528 ^{Lat}Spec 77 115 Arm
 1615 πρὸς αὐτούς] αυτοις B Phil I 150
 1623 αὐριον] bis scr B 82
 1629 om τὰ σάββατα B 376
 1633 ἐμβάλε] -λετε B 82
 1633 om τοῦ 1° B Cyr VI 512 X 900
 1634 μαρτυρίου] θεου B 29
 1635 τὸ μάν / ἔφαγον] tr B 527
 175 μετὰ σεαυτοῦ] σεαυτω B 82
 183 αὐτοῦ] αὐτης B F^b 426 46* 646 Arab = $\mathfrak{M}$
 187 om αὐτοῦ B 82 127
 1818 om σύ 3° B* 72 Cyr Ad 281^V Aeth Arm
 192 ἤλθον] ἤλθοσαν B 82
 197 ἐκάλεσεν] ἐλάλησε(ν) προς B* 527
 198 τοῦ λαοῦ] τουτους B 426 106
 1919 ἐλάλει] -λησεν B 82; ἐλαλή 458
 207 κύριος] + ο θς σου B ^{Lat}Quodv Prom I 49
 2011 καί 2°] $\bigcap$ 3° B^{xt} Sev 435
 2019 μήποτε] μη B 72 Phil II 32 III 5^{Pap} 235^{ap}
 2023 ἐαυτοῖς 1°] αυτοις B 72* 422 74
 2110 om αὐτῷ B* 509 Bo^B
 2135 τεθνηκῶτα] -κοντα B* 120*
 228 αὐτός] αυτον B* 126
 2311 ὑπολειπόμενα] -λιπομενα B* 960 53'
 2319 om τῆς γῆς B* Phil I 232^{Pap} ^{Lat}cod 102 Ambr Ep 35 Ruf Rom VII 5
 2322 ποιήσης] -σητε B 131^c
 2328 ἐκβάλετ] -λεις B 76'
 252 om μοι B 29 68' ^{Lat}Aug C Adim 10
 2511 τέσσαρας] -ρες B* 767
 2519 ταῖς] pr εν B Syh^T
 2533 om οἱ B 106 129 55
 264 om εἰς B* 129
 268 om ἔσται 1° B 58 129 392 55 ^{Lat}Ruf Cant 2 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 268 τῆς 3°] $\bigcap$ 4° B* 76 ^{Lat}cod 100
 268 μέτρον / τὸ αὐτό] tr B ^{Lat}Ruf Cant 2
 2624 ἔσονται 1°] εσται B 129 55
 2637 αὐτοῖς] αυταις B* 46 799
 2711 τῷ 1°] $\bigcap$ 2° B 392 46 55 Cyr Ad 640

- 27¹¹ βάσεις 2°] + *αυτων* B 72 44 509 Cyr *Ad* 640^P
 27¹² πήχεων] *πηχων* B 82 392 55
 28⁵ τήν 1°] *τον* B 376 53' 318 55^c
 28¹⁰ κατά] *και* B* 72 53'
 28¹¹ λίθους] $\bigcap$ (12) B 422 76'
 28²¹ δώδεκα 1°] *δεκα δυο* B 82 129
 28²² ἀλυσιδωτόν] *-του* B 73* 55 ^{Lat}codd 100
 28²⁹ om *δέ* B Cyr *Ad* 744 Bo^A
 28²⁹ om *καί* 5° B* 82' 527(2°)
 28³¹ ἔναντι] *-ντιον* B 53' 75
 28³⁷ ἱερατεύσωσίν] *-τεωσιν* B 707 108-314 44 74
 29³ προσοίσεις] *-σει* B* 392 Cyr *Ad* 752
 29⁶ ἐπιθήσεις 1°] *θησεις* B* 126
 29⁹ ἔμοί] *μοι* B 426
 29⁹ τὰς χεῖρας Ἀαρὼν] *ααρων τ. χ. αυτου* B 55 Cyr *Ad* 752
 29¹⁰ om *αὐτῶν* B* 106-125
 29¹⁷ om *ἐπί* B* 552 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96
 29¹⁸ θυσιάσμα] *θυμαμα* B* 53' 46
 29¹⁸ ἐστίν] *εσται* B Cyr *Ad* 753
 29²⁰ τῆς 1° — δεξιᾶς] *της δεξιας χειρος* B 58 Cyr *Ad* 753
 29²⁴ αὐτούς] *αυτοις* B F*(cprm)
 29²⁶ om *σοι* B* 54
 29²⁸ παρὰ 2°] *απο* B 16
 29³³ αὐτῶν 2°] *αυτου* B Aeth
 30⁷ ἐπισκευάζῃ] *-σκευαση* B* 550' 129
 30⁸ θυμιάσει] *-σεις* B 54 55
 30¹⁵ τοῦ ἡμίσου] *του ημισυ* B 707 129
 30²⁷ καί 3°] *pr και την σκηνην του μαρτυριου και παντα τα σκευη αυτης* B 15 Cyr *Ad* 645
 30²⁸ καί 6°] $\bigcap$ (29) 1° B 15 55 426
 30³⁵ αὐτό] *εν αυτω* B 15 129 55
 31² υἱοῦ] *τον* B 15' 55 426 Clem II 16
 31⁶ δέδωκα 1°] *εδωκα* B 15' 319
 31¹⁴ ἐστιν] + *κῶ* B M 15 18
 31¹⁸ Μωσῆ] *μωσει* B 72
 32⁷ κατὰβηθι] *post ἐντεῦθεν tr* B 15' 129 Cyr *Gl* 529 Sa
 32¹⁴ περὶ — ποιῆσαι] *περιποιησαι* B Cyr IX 749
 32¹⁶ om *ἐστιν* B Phil III 39 ^{Lat}Aug Ex CLXVI 1 Arm
 32¹⁷ τὴν φωνήν] *της φωνης (-νην 107)* B* 73 107* 527
 32²⁶ λευί] *λευει* B 707 127^c
 32²⁷ καί 5°] $\bigcap$ 6° B 76 799
 32²⁸ λευί] *λευει* B 707 127
 33¹⁰ τῶν θυρῶν] *της θυρας* B 82' 129 426
 33¹⁶ ἐγὼ 1°] $\bigcap$ 2° B^{txt} 19 125 527
 33¹⁹ καλέσω] *λαλησω* B 15 407 55 Bo^A
 34² ἄκρου] *ακρους* B 767
 34¹² μῆ] + *σοι* B 15'
 34¹⁴ θεῶ ἐτέρῳ] *θεοις ετεροις* B ^{Lat}codd 100 103 Arm^{tc}
 34¹⁶ τοὺς υἱοὺς] *οι υιοι* B Syh
 34²⁴ ἀπό] *προ* B 15 407 55 426
 34²⁵ θυσιασμάτων] *θυμαμ.* B 55* 426
 34²⁶ εἰσοίσεις] *θησεις* B 15 129^{txt} 318 Sa
 34²⁶ οὐχ ἐπήσεις] *ου προσοισεις* B 15
 34²⁹ χρωτός] *χρωματος* B 72 56 799 Arm
 34³⁰ χρωτός] *χρωματος* B 72 Aeth^P Arm
 35¹⁰ καί 2°] $\bigcap$ 3° B^{txt} M'^{txt} 72 18^{txt}
 35³⁰ υἱοῦ] *τον* B 15' 55 426
 35³⁵ om *καί* 1° B 15-376-767 55 Syh = $\mathfrak{X}$

- 363 Μωυσῆ] μωση B 58 127
 365 εἶπαν] ειπεν B 458
 369 ἐποίησαν] -σεν B F^h G^c 799 = $\mathfrak{R}$
 3610 om τῷ διανενησμένῳ B* 72
 3613 om χρυσῷ γεγλυμμένους B^{txt} 53
 374 τέσσαρας] -ρες B* 767* 19' 129 392
 3711 πήχεων 1°] $\cap$ 2° B 15 55 426
 3713 πέντε — πήχεων] εκατον πεντηκοντα πηχεων (aut -χων) B 15 55
 3713 om καὶ οἱ B F^h LatAug Ex CLXXVII 13 Aeth^C = $\mathfrak{R}$
 3717 om αἱ 2° B F 64* 73 321 509
 3721 Ἀχισαμάχ] -μακ B 58'-82 55*
 387 τό 4° — ἱλαστηρίου 2°] του ἱλ. του δευτερου B 121
 3810 om χρυσοῦς B 15-29-707^{txt} 46
 3816 ἄ] ο B 15 55
 3824 τέσσαρας] -ρες B* 767* 19' 56'
 391 καὶ τριάκοντα] εικοσι B 15 527 126 55 799
 399 αὐλῆς 3°] σκηνης B*(vid) 376 46*
 3910 ἐργαλεῖα] αργαλεια B 458
 3922 om τῷ B 15-82^c 19' 55*
 403 καὶ 1°] $\cap$ 2° B 72 53 130^{txt} 71'
 407 om σκεύη B* 426
 4011 ἱερατεύσει] -τευει B* 134 416*
 4031 om τῆς B 630^s

A number of peculiar characteristics found in *List 1* recur in *List 2*, and need no further mention. Particularly characteristic of *List 2* is the large number of omissions (45), many being palaeographically inspired. On the other hand, only 12 instances of plusses obtain, only one being longer than a simple phrase, 30²⁷. Changes in verbal inflection may involve number, person, voice, tense or mood (20 instances), and in one case a Hellenistic form, 19². Change in nominal inflection may involve gender (4 times), number (3 times), case (8), both number and case (2), and in one case, 8²⁴, the Hellenistic form of the first declension is involved; cf Sect. H 1 of Chap. VII. Two instances of change of pronoun obtain, and three, of preposition. Twice a prepositional phrase is changed to a simple pronoun, 16¹⁵ 17⁵, and the reverse occurs at 30³⁵. A compound stem appears in its simplex form at 12¹² 29⁶, whereas the prepositional element in the compound is changed at 6⁸. Occasionally the stem of Moses' name occurs as $\sqrt{\mu\omega\sigma}$ instead of $\sqrt{\mu\omega\nu\sigma}$ (15²⁴ 31¹⁸ 36³). Other misspellings occur at 6¹⁸ ἰσσαχαρ for Ἰσαάκ, 6²⁰ αμβραν for Ἀμράμ, and 37²¹ αχισαμακ for Ἀχισαμάχ.

Change in lexeme is attested 17 times. These are (with the text of Exod in parentheses) 2¹⁸ δια τι (τί ὅτι); 9³³ ἐξετεινεν (ἐξέπτεσεν); 11¹⁰ εισηκουσεν (ἠθέλησεν); 16³⁴ θεου (μαρτυρίου); 19⁷ ἐλάλησεν προς (ἐκάλεσεν); 19⁸ τουτους (τοῦ λαοῦ); 28¹⁰ και (κατά); 29¹⁸ θυμιαμα (θυσίασμα); 31² 35³⁰ τον (υἱοῦ); 33¹⁹ λαλησω (καλέσω); 34²⁵ θυμιαματων (θυσιασμάτων); 34²⁶ θησεις (εἰσοίσεις); 34²⁶ προσοισεις (ἐψήσεις); 34²⁹ 30 χρωματος (χρωτός); 39⁹ σκηνης (αὐλῆς).

It remains to determine whether any text groups have been influenced by the B tradition to some extent. *List 3* gives all instances in which a variant text in B is also supported by no more than three text groups. A text group will only be recognized as such when at least one half of its extant manuscript witnesses support a reading.

Readings designated as O, however, may include members of *oI* and/or *oII*; such a mixture will be recognized as O if at least six mss including at least one O witness are in support. C may be C, *cI*, *cII*, or any combination thereof. To help the reader these group identifications are placed in parentheses in front of the citations.

List 3

- 215 (*f n z*) κατώκησεν] ωκησεν B 15 53'-56* *n* 392 68'-120' 55 130
35 (*f z*) καί (εἶπεν)] ο δε B M^{ms} 15' 56'-129 *z* 799
36 (*oII*) om αὐτῷ B 15'-707 56* 55 799 Carl 49 Cyr *Gl* 468 = $\mathfrak{M}$
39 (*O f z*) καὶ ἐγὼ] καγω B 15'-58' *f z* 130 799 Cyr *Ad* 240
311 (*O b n*) εἰμι] + (✕ Arm^{ms}) ἐγω A^c B F^b 15'-72-135*-426-*oI* 126-550' *b n*⁻⁶²⁸ 527 55 130
509 ClemR XVII 5 Cyr *Ad* 240 Tht *Ex* 112 II 500 Latcod 100 Arm Sa
312 (*n*) ἀποστελλῶ] ἐξαποστελῶ B 15'-426 413 *n*⁻⁴⁵⁸ 799
41 (*C z*) om οὖν B 15'-64* C'' 19' 129 527 *z* Cyr *Ad* 240 *Gl* 469 LatAmbr *Ep* VIII 8 Aug *Loc*
in hept II 13 Arm Bo
46 (*f*) εἰσένεγκε] -γκον B 843 82 56^c-129-246 Cyr *Ad* 245^{RV} Or IV 462
47 (*f z*) αὐτοῦ 3°] αὐτης B 15'-72 500 *f*⁻¹²⁹ 458 *z* 130 799
411 (*z*) om κύριος 2° B 82-426 68'-120' Arm
412 (*b*) ἄ] ο B 15' *b* Co
426 (*z*) om comma B 135 14*(cprm)-52'-313'-739 628 527 68'-120' 424
512 (*O y*) Αἰγύπτῳ] pr (✕ Syh) γῇ B M O^{-64*72}-29 19' 321 *y*⁻³⁹² 18 55 59 130 799 Latcod 100
Arab Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
612 (*f*) ἐναντίον] ἐναντι B 56'-129
615 (*f*) Ὡαδ] ιωαδ B 56'-129 120' 799
622 (*z*) Σετρί] σεγρει B 835 68'-120' Ach
627 (*x*) ἐξ] εκ γῆς B 126 30' *x* 318' 59 646 Aeth
89 (*d f s*) τοῦ 1°] pr περι B 64^{ms}-376 *d*⁻¹²⁵ *f*⁻¹²⁹ *s*⁽⁻³⁴³⁾ 84-370 392 55 130 799 LatAmbr *Cain*
I 33 Aeth = $\mathfrak{M}$
810 (*C x*) εἰδῆς] ιδῆς B 15'-29-64' C'' 19' 44 127' *x* 318-527 18 59 76' 130 646'
821 (*O f*) κυνομυίας] -μυιης B 58-426-707 56'-129 55*
823 (*f*) om τὸ σημεῖον B *f*
828 (*f*) ἐξαποστελῶ] αποστελλῶ B 15-426 *f* Cyr *Ad* 196^{RV}
831 (*f z*) om ἀπό 2° B 82 56'-129 68'-120' 130 799 Sa
93 (*x z*) ἔσται] επεσται B 72-82* *x* 527 120'-128' 130 646
93 (*f z*) om ἐν 4° B 82 44 *f* 527 *z* Sa
94 (*z*) ἐγὼ] + εν τῷ καιρῷ ἐκεινῷ A^c B 318' *z* 130 799
99 (*d f t*) γῆν] pr την B 82-135 25 *d*⁻¹²⁵ *f* 75' 85' *t*⁻⁸⁴ 120'
99 (*x*) om ἐν ult B 314* *x* 122*
104 (*O*) θέλῃς] + συ B O⁻⁷²-15' 56-129 527 120-128' Arm Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
105 (*f x*) περισσόν] + της γῆς B M^{ms} 82 *f* 75' *x* 318' 120-128' 130 799 Sa
106 (*f x*) Αἰγύπτου] των αιγυπτιων B 82 56-129-664 *x* 120
107 (*f n*) λέγουσιν δέ] και λεγ. B 82 *f n* 120-128' 799
107 (*f*) om κυρίῳ B 82 *f*⁻²⁴⁶
1010 (*d t x*) πρόκειται] προσκειται B 58-82 *d* 75 85' *t x* 392-527 130
1011 (*x*) λατρεύσατε] -σατωσαν B* 19' *x* 646^c Latcod 104 Aeth Arm Bo^A
1011 (*d x*) ζητεῖτε] ἐζητετε B 82 *d* 370^c *x* 120-128 799 Arm
1014 (*x*) μετ' αὐτήν] μετα ταυτα B 376^c 52*(vid) 56-129 *x* 120-128' 130 799
1023 (*f*) αὐτοῦ 1°] + τρεις ημερας B 82 *f*⁻²⁴⁶ 527 120 130 799 Latcod 104 Aug *Loc* in hept II
56 Arm Sa
1029 (*n*) Μωσῆς] μωσης B(l) 15-135-426 *n*
112 (*d f t*) πλησίον 1°] ∩ 2° B* *d* 53'-129^{txt} 458 *t*⁻⁴⁶ 68'-120
117 (*n*) παραδοξάσει] -ξάζει B 707* 56*-246 *n*⁻⁶²⁸ 392-527 130 799 Latcodd 101 102
119 (*f*) πληθύνω] pr πληθυνων B 58-82 *f*⁻²⁴⁶ 392 120-128' 76' 130 799
1110 (*O n x*) Μωσῆς] μωσης B 15-72-426 *n x*
121 (*O s*) Αἰγύπτῳ] -πτου B O⁻⁴²⁶-15-29*(vid) 126 537 56*-246 127 85-321^{txt}-343' 392-527
120 130 509 Or IV 183 PsHipp 125

- 123 (x) πρόβατον 2°] pr εααστος A^c B 82 131^(c2) 56^c-129 x 392 120-128' 130 Sa³
 125 (f) ἀμνῶν] αρναν B 707 f⁻²⁴⁶ 392-527 76' 130 799 PsHipp *Pascha* 125
 127 (οΙΙ x) ἄν] εαν B 15-82' 127 343' x 392 120-128'
 1210 (b t) καταλειπόμενα] -λιπ. B 78-126 b 46-74' 318 18* 130 799
 1214 (f) τάς] pr πασας B 82 f⁻²⁴⁶ Cyr *Ad* 1065
 1217 (n) φυλάξεσθε] -ξετε (aut -ται) B 246 n
 1220 (f n x) παντί] + δε B 58-82 x 392 120-128' 130
 1221 (O C f) Ἰσραήλ] pr υιωv 58-381'-426 C''⁻¹⁶ 126⁵⁰⁰ 610 56'-129 458-628 128 424 646 Pro-
 cop 576 Arm Sa
 1221 (f) θύσατε] -σετε (aut -ται) B 82-381*-618 125 f⁻²⁴⁶ 75'
 1228 (n) Μωυση] μωση B 426 n⁻⁶²⁸
 1230 (x) ἀνέστη] αναστας B M^{mg} x
 1232 (O f x) δέ] δη B F 72-381'-οΙΙ⁻¹⁵ 54 19' 53'-246 628 30-85^{mg} x 55 59 130 799
 1237 (f n x) ἀπήραν] απαραντες B 707 552^{txt} 19' f n x 527 120-128'
 1246 (οΙ C f) ούκ] pr και B οΙ-82' C'' f 75' 84 318-527 130 Or *Sel* 288 Latcod 104 Aeth Arab
 Arm
 133 (n s) ἐξ 1°] εκ (+ της 458) γης B 135 n s 619 392 130 799 Latcod 104 MissRom 85 Arab
 Co Syh
 137 (b) om τάς B b
 1311 (O f x) δῶ] δωσει B F^b 15'-58-376^c-707^c 52'-73'-413-761 19' f⁻⁵³ 75 134 x 318 120 55^c
 59 76' 130 Cyr *Gl* 436^P X 620 701 LatAmbr *Cain* I 42
 1312 (b) ἄν] εαν B 15-426-707 118'-537 Phil I 239^{UF} 244^{UF}
 145 (z) πεποιήκαμεν] εποιησαμεν B 82 129 127* 120-128'-628
 147 (x) ἔλαβεν] λαβων B 82' 129 x Cyr *Ad* 269
 149 (x z) εὔρον] ευροσαν B 58-82 x 120-128'-628
 1420 (f z) καὶ ἐγένετο] pr και εστη A^c B 82 19' f^{-56^{txt}} 458 392-527 120-128'-628 130 799 Cyr
Ad 269 Sa
 1423 (O x z) κατεδίωξαν δέ] και κατ. B 58'-82 129 x 120-128'-628 130
 1428 (O f) οὐ] pr και B O⁻⁴²⁶-15' 19' f^{-56*} 527 120-628-630 508 Latcod 111 Ps Ambr *Mans* 5
 Arab Arm Bo
 1430 (O f z) Αἰγυπτίων] pr των B 58'-82-381' 126-551-552 f 75 30' 392-527 120-128'-628 55
 130 508 799
 1520 (b) ἔλαβεν] λαβουσα B M^{mg} 707 b⁻³¹⁴ 56* 527 Syh^{Lmg}
 1527 (f z) ἤλθον] -θοσαν B 82 53'-56^c-129 392 z 130
 161 (O z) ἤλθον] -θοσαν B 58'-82 129 392 120-128'-628 130
 165 (O f) ἄν 1°] εαν B O⁻⁵⁸-15' 52'-313' 53'-56* 458 318 130 799 Cyr *Gl* 449 VI 508
 165 (O f x) ἄν 2°] εαν B 15-72-376 52'-78-126-313'-422 53'-56* 127 x 318-527 130 799 Cyr
Gl 449^{F*} VI 508
 166 (O n z) εἶπεν δέ] και ειπεν B O⁻²⁹ 72 19' 129 n 120-128'-628 130 Cyr VI 508 Syh
 1618 (O f n) ἐμέτρησαν] μετρησαντες A^(c) B 58'-82 19' f⁽⁻⁵³⁾ n 130 799 Cyr *Gl* 453^F
 1622 (f z) εἰσῆλθον] -θοσαν B 58-82 f 392 z 130
 1623 (n) τὸ ῥῆμά / ἐστιν] tr B 707 n 30' Latcodd 102 104
 1623 (O f) ἄν 2°] εαν B O⁻³⁷⁶ 126 56'-129 318 120 799 Cyr *Ad* 505
 1624 (f z) κατέλιπον] -ποσαν (-λειπ. 58-82 129) B 58-82 f⁽⁻⁵³⁾ 318 120-128'-628 130
 1624 (f n s) ἕως] εις το B M 82 f⁽⁻⁵³⁾ n 30'-85-321^{txt}-344^{txt} 318 18 46 Cyr *Gl* 453 Arm
 1624 (d t) αὐτῶ] αυτοις B 72 73-413 d⁻⁴⁴ t
 1627 (O f z) ἐξῆλθον] -θοσαν B 58'-82 f 120-128'-628 130
 1631 (t z) ἐπωνόμασαν] + αυτο (το 44) B 58-82 19' 44 129 75 t z Latcodd 102 104 Aeth Bo
 1633 (O n) Μωυσης] μωσης B O⁻³⁷⁶-15 313 n
 1633 (s t) πλήρες] -ρης B 29 458 s t 318 59
 1635 (f) γῆν] την B 426*-707 126 f 120-128-628 509 799 Sa
 1635 (f) ἔραγον 2°] -γοσαν B 58^{mg}-82 56'-129 120-128-628
 173 (O b) ὁ λαός 2°] pr εκει B 15'-58-376 b 120-128-628 Latcod 102 Arm^{ap}
 173 (x) ἐπί] προς B F 106-125 x 59 Latcodd 102 104 Aug *Loc in hept* II 90
 176 (f) λαός] + μου B M^{mg} 82 f 318' 120-128-628 799 Cyr *Gl* 488 492 Latcodd 102 104
 Quodv *Prom* I 56
 1714 (z) ἐν βιβλίῳ] εις βιβλιον B z Cyr *Ad* 277 X 844

- 1715 (Ο) μου καταφύγη] tr B O-15 108 76' Cyr *Ad* 273 ^{Lat}cod 104(vid) Ruf *Num* XIX 1 Syh = $\mathfrak{R}$
- 184 (fz) [ο] pr λεγων B 58-82 19' f 392-527 z 76' Cyr *Ad* 280 Aeth^C Arm Sa
- 185 (fz) [ηλθεν] εξηλθεν B 82 f 68'-120'
- 186 (z) Μωυση] -σει B 343 68'-120'
- 188 (Ο n) Μωυσης] μωσης B O-³⁷⁶-15 n 343 76
- 1810 (x) τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ] αὐτους B 426 x Arm Syh
- 1814 (f) ἐποίει] ποιει B f-^{246*} Sa
- 1825 (Ο n) Μωυσης] μωσης B O-³⁷⁶-15 107' n
- 1826 (fz) ἔκρινον] -νοσαν B 82 56'-129 120'-128'-628
- 1826 (fn z) τό 1°] παν B 58-82' fn 318' 120'-128'-628 ^{Lat}cod 104 Sa
- 1826 (fz) ἀνέφερον] -ροσαν B 56'-129 120'-128'-628
- 1826 (f) ἔκρινον 2°] -νοσαν B 56'-129
- 191 (fz) ἦλθον] -θοσαν B M^{ms} 82 f 392 120'-128'-628 799
- 193 (Ο n) Μωυσης] μωσης B O-³⁷⁶-15 126 n⁽⁴⁵⁸⁾
- 193 (b) ὄρους] οὐνοῦ B 118'-537 246*(cprm) 76'
- 199 (Ο n) Μωυσην] μωσιν B 15-72-426 126 107' n
- 199 (n) Μωυσης] μωσης B 15-426 n
- 1913 (x) οὐχ] ουκ B* 58*-82 x
- 1918 (Ο) τὸν θεόν / ἐπ' αὐτό] tr B O-³⁷⁶-15 129 Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{R}$
- 1919 (Ο d n) Μωυσης] μωσης B O-³⁷⁶-15 77-78-126-414'-552* 19' 107'-125 n Phil III 5
- 1924 (n) om καὶ ἀνάβηθι B* 15-376^{txt} 78-413 n⁻¹²⁷ 55 Sa: homoiot
- 2020 (Ο n) Μωυσης] μωσης B O-³⁷⁶-15 126 n
- 2023 (d t) ποιήσετε 1°] + υμιν B 707 d t
- 2024 (Ο γ) ὀλοκαυτώματα] + (※Syh) υμων B O-15-707 458 γ-³⁹² 68' 424 Cyr *Ad* 592^E Arm Sa Syh: cf $\mathfrak{R}$
- 2024 (x) τά 3°] pr και B 15-29-376-618 x 527
- 2025 (f) αὐτό] αὐτους B 72 610*(vid) 53'-56^c-129
- 211 (d) παραθήσεις] -ση B 107'-125 Or *Sel* 293
- 216 (Ο z) πρὸς 2°] επι B O-³⁷⁶ 25 19' 44 392^c 120'-128-630 426
- 216 (Ο n) αὐτοῦ / ὁ κύριος] tr B O-15-707 n 30' 84 ^{Lat}codd 91 94 95 = $\mathfrak{R}$
- 2116 (z) θανάτω] ad fin tr B 82 56-664 527 120'-128'-628 426 799 Cyr *Ad* 508 Did Ps 112.8
- 2116 (Ο z) τελευτάτω] τελευτησει B O-³⁷⁶-82' 129 127^c 392-527 120'-128'-628 426 799 Cyr *Ad* 508 Did Ps 112.8 Sa
- 2118 (z) πατάξῃ] -ξωσιν B 72 19' 68'-120' 424 Syh
- 2118 (Ο z) om τίς B O-⁵⁸-15-29 19' 53' 127 68'-120' 424 Aeth Syh
- 2123 (f) ἦ] ην B 82 f-²⁴⁶ 458 321* 319 799
- 2131 (b z) κερατίση] post θυγατέρα tr B 82 b 44 129 z 424 426 Cyr *Ad* 525 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm
- 2136 (b) om αὐτοῦ B* 118'-537 392
- 221 (n) om αὐτό B 82'-767 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 527 Cyr *Ad* 533 ^{Lat}PsAmbr *Lex* 11 Aeth Arm
- 225 (Ο z) ἦ 2°] και B O-⁷⁶⁷-15 z 424 426 799 Cyr *Ad* 556 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{R}$
- 2211 (oII) οὐ μή] ουκ B 15-29-707^c 527 319^c(vid)
- 2220 (f) ἐξολεθρευθήσεται (cvar)] pr θανάτω B 58-82 f-^{56*} 527
- 2230 (b z) ἡμέρα τῇ ὁδόῃ] ογδ. ημ. B 82 126 118'-537 129 120'-128'-628 426 Cyr *Gl* 436
- 232 (d s) προστεθήσῃ] προσθηση (aut -σει) B* 707 d 129*(cprm) s 55 799 Clem I 252
- 2311 (n x) θηρία τὰ ἄγρια] αγρ. θηρ. B 82'-767 19' 129 n x 392 ^{Lat}Aug *Ex* 89
- 2312 (s) ἀναπαύσῃ] -σις (-σης 30) B 82 30'-85-343'
- 2312 (z) ἀναψύξῃ] αναπανσηται (cvar) B* 500 z 426 646* Co
- 2318 (C f x) θυσιάσματος] θυμιαμ. A^c B C⁻⁴²² 19' f-²⁴⁶ 30'-130* x 646' Tht *Ex* 137^{ap}
- 2319 (Ο) οὐχ] ουκ B* M 72-767-oII-¹⁵ 127^c 18 46 55 509 Cyr *Ad* 701 Tht *Ex* 137
- 2328 (Ο f z) om τούς 2° B 72-82-767 f 128'-407-628 426
- 2328 (fz) om τούς 3° B 82 f 128'-407-628 426 799
- 2330 (Ο C d) om μικρόν 2° B O-³⁷⁶-82 C" d 30' 646 ^{Lat}codd 91 94 95 Aug *Iud* XVII 4 *Loc in hept* II 110 Aeth
- 2331 (fz) ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου] μεγαλον ποταμον B 72-82-381' 125 56^c-129-246 318 128'-407-628 55 426 509

- 241 (z) κύριον] pr τον B 128'-407-628 426
 242 (n) Μωσῆς] μωσης B 15-72 551 n 527
 2413 (n) idem B 15-72 126 n
 253 (O) χαλκόν] pr (※ Syh) και B 15-72-376 Latcod 102 Aeth^{MPR} Arab Arm Bo Syh = 𐤀𐤊𐤋
 2512 (b n s) ἐκ ξύλων ἀσῆπτων] ξυλα ασηπτα B M^{txt} 82' 118'-537 56* n 85'^{txt}-130'^{txt}-343-344^{txt}
 392 126 18 46 55 799
 2525 (f) δακτυλίου 2°] pr τεσσαρας (-ρες B*) B f^{-56°} Bo
 2531 (x) λυχνίας 1°] ∩ 2° B^{txt} 53 x
 2533 (O f z) καρυίσκου] + εν τω (> 15-376) ενι καλαμισκω (cvar) B O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15' 131' 19' f 318'
 68'-120' 55 799
 2534 (z) fin] + και εν τη λυχνια τεσσαρες κρατηρες εκτετυπωμενοι καρυισκου (-οις 68'-120') B
 58-82 129 127* 370^{mg} 68'-120' 55
 2610 (O) om τήν B 15-72-376-oI
 2627 (b x y) τῷ 2°] + ενι B 82-707* 761 118'-537 129 x y⁻³¹⁸ 55
 2633 (O x z) διοριεῖ] -ριεις B* 58' x 68'-120'-126^(mg)
 274 (f) τέσσαρας] -ρες B* 56'-129
 276 (x) φορεῖς | τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ] tr B* x 55
 277 (O z) om τά B 15'-72-381'-708-767 77-739 44-125 75 730 z⁻¹²⁶ 18 59 426 509 799
 279 (x) om ἐκ βύσσου κεκλωσμένης B x 392 55 Latcod 100: homoiot
 279 (f n) πήχεων] πηχων B 82 f n⁻¹²⁷ 55 799
 2711 (f) idem B 82 f⁻¹²⁹ 392 55 799
 2712 (x) δέκα 2°] ∩ (13)2° B^{txt} 767^{txt} 52'-73^{txt}-761 730 x 628
 2714 (x z) τῶν ιστίων | τὸ ὕψος] tr B 82 56*-246 x 392 z 55 426 799 Bo Syh
 2715 (f) πήχεων] πηχων B F 82 f⁻¹²⁹ 392 55 76' 799
 2716 (f) idem B 82 f⁻¹²⁹ 392 55 799
 2718 (d f t) idem B F 15'-29-64* d⁽⁻¹⁰⁶⁾ f⁻¹²⁹ t 392 55 59 76' 509 799
 2718 (z) om αἱ B 68'-120'
 2720 (f x) φῶς] + καυσαι B f x 392 55 76' 799 Cyr VI 404
 284 (x) om καί 4° B 82-767 129 127 x Aeth^{FGHM}
 286 (x) ὑφαντόν] -ντου B 52 610 x 527
 2816 (x) om ποιήσεις αὐτό B*(vid) 71' Latcod 100
 2819 (O d) om καί 2° B O⁻⁷⁶⁷-82' 44'-125 527 126 Latcod 100 Syh = 𐤀𐤊𐤋
 2826 (O n) ἔναντι 1°] -ντιον B O⁻⁷²-82 129 n⁻¹²⁷ 128 Phil I 139
 2826 (O f) ἔναντι 2°] -ντιον B O-29 53'-129 75 527(2°) 59 426
 2829 (n x) ἐπί 1°] υπο B* n⁻¹²⁷ 71'
 2839 (s x) ὅταν 1°] ὡς αν B 82-376 129 127 85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343' 71' 55 Cyr Ad 749^V
 2839 (z) om ἡ B* 527 68'-120'
 291 (z) ἀγιάσαι] -σεις B 82-376 131' z 55 426 Cyr Ad 749 Arm Syh
 2928 (O x) ἀφαίρεμα 1°] ἀφορισμα B O⁻³⁷⁶-82 71' 55 Cyr Ad 753
 2928 (f x) σωτηριών] + των υιων ιηλ Ac B 82 f 71' 55 799
 2942 (oII) om τάς 1° B oII⁻²⁹ 125 127 55
 2942 (oII) om τάς 2° B oII⁻²⁹
 308 (z) om τάς B M^{txt} 15'-64^{txt} 127 527(2°) z 18 46^s 426
 309 (f) ἀνοίσεις] -σει B* 53'-56 55
 309 (x) om καί 2° B* 71'
 3012 (b n) om τῷ B 15-707 b⁻¹⁹ n 55 426 Cyr Ad 344^{PR}
 3020 (x) om ἡ B 707 537 71' 319 Aeth
 3032 (C f) ποιήσεται] ποιηθησεται B 15' C" f⁻¹²⁹ 30' 646' Cyr Ad 645
 3037 (O n) ἑαυτοῖς] αυτοις B F^b O⁻³⁷⁶-707-707^I 500* 129 n 527 55
 3038 (f) αὐτοῦ] αυτης B* 707 f⁻¹²⁹ 527 392 799
 312 (C) Οὐρί] ουρ(ε)ιον B 82 C" 527 46 55 Cyr Ad 648
 314 (O n x) ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν] -τονησαι (cvar) B O-15'-707^I n 71' 392 426 Clem II 16
 314 (O) καί 7°] ∩ (s)1° B 15-72-376-707^I 426 Arm
 321 (O n) Μωσῆς 2°] μωσης B 58'-707 n
 327 (x z) οὐς] ον B 15'-58-767^c 246 x 392 z Cyr Gl 529 IX 749 Latcod 100 Arm
 328 (f) προσκεκυνήκασιν] προσεκυν. (cvar) B 376 44 53'-246 55* 319* 509
 328 (d t) αὐτῷ 1°] ∩ 2° B 15-707-767 500 d 53' 130 t 126-628 59 Cyr Gl 529 Sa

- 3211 (*fz*) om *αὐτοῦ* B 15' *f*⁽⁻⁵³⁾ z 426 799 Or II 331 Sa
 3211 (*fxz*) *βραχίονι*] *τω βρ. σου* B 15' 56'-129 71' 392 68'-120' 55 799
 3215 (*z*) *γεγραμμέναι* 1°] *καταγεγρ.* B 15 392 68'-120'
 3219 (*x*) *ήνικα δέ*] *και ηνικα* B 15' 129 71' 55 Phil II 188
 3220 (*f*) *ἐπί*] *υπο* B* 64*(vid)-767 414' 610 53'-56 84-134 619 628
 3221 (*x*) *πρός*] *τω* B 15' 129 71' 55
 3226 (*fz*) om *πρός αὐτόν* B^{xt} 53'-246 68'-120'
 3230 (*O n*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσῆς* B 58' 73* *n* 527
 3231 (*fz*) *ἐπέστρεψεν*] *υπεστρ.* B 15' *f*⁻¹²⁹ 68'-120' 55 799
 3234 (*Cxz*) *βάδιζε*] + *καταβηθι* B 15' 73'-550' 129 71' 126-128'-628 426 GregNys II 276s
 Arm Sa
 3234 (*OC*) *προπορεύεται*] *-ρενεται* B 15-72-οΙ *C*⁻⁷⁷ 19 56-129 130 318' 319 Clem I 124 Eus
 VI 238 Syh
 332 (*z*) *ἐκβαλεῖ*] *-λεις* B* 68'-120'
 335 (*f*) *ἐπαγάγω*] *επαξω εγω* B *f*⁻¹²⁹
 337 (*Cdz*) *παρεμβολῆς* 1°] $\cap$ 2° B* 29-72 *C*^{-131mg}-25^{xt}-761 107'-125 134 68'-120' 46 319
 646 Bo
 338 (*On*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσῆς* B 58' *n* 527
 338 (*z*) *σκηνὴν* 1°] + *ἐξω της παρεμβολης* B 29 314 *z*⁽⁻¹²⁸⁾ 46 Aeth
 338 (*Ob*) *κατενοοῦν*] *-νοουσαν* B 15'-58' *b* 129 55 426(vid)
 338 (*On*) *Μωσῆ*] *μωση* B 58' *n* 527
 339 (*On*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσῆς* B 58' *n*
 339 (*Cf*) *τῶν θυρῶν*] *την θυραν* B 15'-376 73'-550' *f* 392 126 55 799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ambr *Ps*
duod XLIII 28.2 Luc *Conven* 1 Aeth Sa = $\mathfrak{R}$
 339 (*n*) *Μωσῆ*] *μωση* B 58 44 *n*^{-75°}
 3311 (*fx*) *λαλήσαι*] *-σει* B 15-708^c 16-131^c 106-125 53'-129 127 *x*⁻⁷¹ 407 46 55 59 426 646
 Chr X 328 Tht IV 49
 3318 (*C*) *δεῖξόν* —fin] *εμφανισον μοι σεαυτον* B ^{Fb} 15 73'-550' 129 55 Sa
 344 (*x*) om *τὸ πρῶί* B 15 129 71' 55 Cyr IX 952 Sa
 344 (*n*) om *μεθ' αὐτοῦ* B 15-618^{xt}-707-767 44 *n* 619 318 55 426 Cyr IX 952
 346 (*dnx*) *κύριος κύριος*] *semel scr* B 15'-767 54-73* *d* 53' *n*⁻¹²⁷ 85 *x* 318 55 59 319 426 509
 799 Cyr VI 944 HymenHier 17 ^{Lat}codd 100 103 Aeth Arab Arm
 348 (*On*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσῆς* B 58' *n* 730 527
 3411 (*Ox*) om *ἐγώ* 2° B *O*⁻⁷⁶⁷-15' 73-422 127 730 71' 407 319 426 Sa
 3411 (*f*) *Χετταῖον*] et *Φερεζαῖον* tr B *f*⁻¹²⁹ 392 799
 3413 (*nz*) *πυρί*] pr *εν* B 64*(vid) 500 *n*⁻¹²⁷ 318 126-128'-628 Syh
 3415 (*Ox*) *θυσιαῶν*] *θυματων* B *O*^{-29 767} 71' 55 426
 3424 (*z*) *ἐμπλατύνω*] *πλατυνω* B 15' 16-73 129 730 126-128'-407-628 55
 3424 (*Ofn*) *οὐθεις*] *ουδεις* B 15'-58' *f* *n*⁻¹²⁷ 407 55 426 799
 3425 (*n*) *ἐορτῆς*] pr *της* B 552 *n*⁻¹²⁷
 3428 (*Cs*) *ἐναντι*] *-ντιον* B 707 *C*ⁿ 75 *s*⁻¹³⁰ 527 Cyr *Gl* 536
 3429 (*n*) *Μωσῆς* 2°] *μωσῆς* B 500 *n* 527
 3430 (*f*) *αὐτῷ*] *αυτου* B 82 53'-56* 392* 55 509 799
 3431 (*On*) *Μωσῆς* 1°] *μωσῆς* B 58' *n*
 3434 (*Od n*) *idem* B 58' 78 *d*⁻⁴⁴ *n* 527
 3435 (*On*) *Μωσῆ*] *μωση* B 58' *n*
 354 (*On*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσῆς* B 58' *n*
 3520 (*n*) *Μωσῆ*] *μωση* B 422 *n* 527
 3521 (*f*) *αὐτῶν* 2°] + *αφαιρεμα* (*cvar*; + $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ 129) *και* B 15' *f* 392 55 799
 3524 (*oIf*) *ἀφαίρεμα*] pr *το* B *oII*⁻²⁹ *f* 392 55 799
 3524 (*z*) *εἰς*] pr *και* B 15 129 68'-120'
 3527 (*nz*) om *εἰς* 2° B 15 19 *n* 68'-120' 55 Cyr *Ad* 345 Bo
 3529 (*d*) *εἰσελθόντας*] *-ντα* B* 15 107'-125 129
 3530 (*C*) *Οὐρί*] *ουριον* (*-ρειον* B*) B 15-707 *C*ⁿ-54 57 73 131^{mg} 527 318 126 424
 3534 (*O*) *Ἀχισαμάχ*] *-μακ* B 58'-82 121 416^c(vid) ^{Lat}cod 103(vid)
 3535 (*Ox*) om *τά* 3° B *O*^{-29 767} 610 129 127 *x* 416^c
 362 (*On*) *Μωσῆς*] *μωσῆς* B 58' *n*

- 362 (O b) om τόν B O⁻²⁹ (376) b 392 55
 363 (d t) om πρωί 2° B 72 d t 527 Latcod 100 Aeth^P Arab
 366 (n) Μωσῆς] μωσης B 72 n
 3610 (n x) om σύν 2° B 15'-72-618* 25 129 n 71' 126 55 509 Latcod 100 Bo
 3620 (n) χρυσόλιθος] -θον B n⁻⁴⁵⁸
 3621 (O x) κατὰ τὰ ὀνόματα] εκ των ονοματων B G-15-58' 129 127 71' 55 Arab Arm Syh
 3621 (x) ἐγγεγλυμμένοι] ἐγγεγραμμενα (cvar) B 118*-314 71' 55
 3621 (x) σφραγίδες] εις σφραγιδας B 15' 129 71'
 3627 (oII z) ἐπί 2°] pr και B oII⁻²⁹ 52'-313' 129 68'-120' 55
 3629 (b) ἐπωμίδος 2°] ∩ 3° B^{txt} 118'-537 799
 372 (d n t) πήχεων 2°] πηχων B 29-82 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ 246* n⁻¹²⁷ t 46 319 426 509
 373 (O) ἐποίησαν] -σεν B F^h O Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = 𐤒𐤓
 374 (z) χρυσίω] pr εν B 68'-120'
 376 (f x) om αὐτῶν 1° B 15 53-56-129 71' 392 55 426 799
 376 (n x γ) αὐτῶν 2°] ∩ 3° B 15-381'-707 19' n 71' γ 126 55 426 Latcod 100 Aeth^C Arm
 3719 (n) Μωσῆ] μωση B n⁻⁴⁵⁸
 3720 (O) Οὐρί] ουρ(ε)ιου B 376-oII⁻²⁹ 52'-414'-552-761 129 527 55
 3720 (n) Μωσῆ] μωση B n⁻⁴⁵⁸
 3721 (d n t) φυλῆς] pr της B M' 15^c-82 d⁻¹⁰⁶ 129* n⁻⁷⁵ 130 t 527 392 18 55 426
 3721 (O b z) ποικιλτά] -τικα B O⁻³⁷⁶ b 68'-120'
 382 (n) καί 3°] ∩ (3)1° B 15-707 19' 44 n 392 55 426 Latcodd 100 104
 383 (d) τέσσαρας] -ρες B* 707*-767* 19' d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ 129 392
 386 (n x z) δύο] pr τους B 15 19' 129 n 71' 318' 68'-120' 55 426
 3810 (f) τέσσαρας] -ρες (cvar) B 707*-767* 19' 44' f 799
 3817 (f) αὐτῆς 3°] αυτων B 15' 56-129-246* 127* 392 799 Bo Pal
 3818 (x) τοῖς στύλοις] τω στυλω B 15 19' 71' 55 426 Pal
 3820 (x z) τῇ πύλῃ] την πυλην B 15 129 71' 68'-120' 55
 3820 (n x) αὐτοῦς] αυτας B 15-707 129 n⁻¹²⁷ 71' 55
 3824 (x) εὐρεῖς / τοῖς μοχλοῖς] tr B 15' 129 71' 55 426
 3827 (n) Μωσῆς] μωσης B G-58 550' n 527
 391 (z) τριάκοντα] εικοσι B 15 56' 527 z 55 426 799
 393 (z) τρισχίλιους καὶ πεντακοσίους] -λιοι πεντακοσιοι B 68'-120'
 394 (f x z) κεφαλίδαν] pr εκατον B 15-29 56^c-129-246 71' z 46 55 Arm
 397 (z) δισχίλιοι] χιλιοι B 129 68'-120' 55
 397 (f x z) τετρακόσιοι] πεντακ. B 15-707 f 71' 392 68'-120' 55 799
 3918 (f n) αὐτῆς τά] tr B 53'-56 n⁻¹²⁷ 130-321 509 799
 3920 (n x) καί 3°] ∩ 4° B 15-707^{txt} 19' 129 n 71' 392 55 426 Latcodd 100 103
 3922 (n) Μωσῆ] μωση B n⁻⁴⁵⁸
 3922 (z) παρασκευήν] αποσκ. B 15 527 68'-120' 55
 3923 (n) Μωσῆς 1°] μωσης B 72 n
 405 (f x) om τό 4° et τοῦ 2° B 15-707 f⁻²⁴⁶ 71' 392 55 426 799
 409 (x) om τὸ θυσιαστήριον 2° B* 71'
 4014 (n) Μωσῆς] μωσης B G n 527 416*
 4016 (n) idem B G n 527
 4017 (f z) αὐτῇ] αυτης (-τοις 53^c-246^c-664) B 44 53'-246 68'-120' 646
 4020 (z) ἔθηκεν] επεθ. B* 29' 54 527 392 68'-120' 46 319 Latcod 103
 4029 (O n) Μωσῆς] μωσης B G-58 739 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 527

The following table gives the number of instances in which text groups support a variant reading found also in B. Column A gives the number in which only one text group supports such a reading; Column B, two supporting groups, and Column C, three supporting groups.

<i>Text groups</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>Total</i>
<i>O</i>	10	44	21	75
<i>oI</i>	—	—	1	1
<i>oII</i>	4	3	—	7
<i>C</i>	3	5	7	15
<i>b</i>	7	7	4	18
<i>d</i>	3	7	12	22
<i>f</i>	34	37	24	95
<i>n</i>	26	32	18	76
<i>s</i>	1	6	3	10
<i>t</i>	—	7	6	13
<i>x</i>	29	26	18	73
<i>y</i>	—	2	2	4
<i>z</i>	27	36	18	81

These totals do give a somewhat false picture of possible relationships in that a recurring variant occurs 35 times. It concerns the spelling of Moses' name. These variant spellings use the stem $\sqrt{\mu\omega\sigma}$ rather than the more usual $\sqrt{\mu\omega\nu\sigma}$. B usually has the normal spelling, but for 35 times it has the shorter stem; this shorter stem is consistently found in *n* and often occurs in some of the *O* mss. This ought to be assessed as a single variant, i.e. the *n* group total should be reduced by 34 to 42, and the *O* group by 19 to 56.

Three groups stand out significantly as being close to, or at least influenced by, the B tradition; these are *f* with 95 agreements, *z* with 81, and *x* with 73. The others in ranked order are *O* 56; *n* 42; *d* 22; *b* 18; *C* 15; *t* 13; *s* 10; *oII* 7; *y* 4, and *oI* 1.

Certain individual mss might also be mentioned here. In the above list agreements of particular interest with such mss are 123 instances for ms 82; 99, for 15; 73, for 55; 65, for 799, and 52, for 527.

That these seem to be somewhat significant becomes clearer when *List 2* is also examined. These were all instances of B variants supported by no more than five other witnesses (including patristic as well as versional support). For these same mss the support ranks similarly, viz. 29 instances for ms 82; 23, for 15; 20, for 55; 8, for 527, and 6, for 799. That 15' out of the *oII* group are particularly influenced by the B tradition seems indicated by these figures.

B. In this study the A tradition is contrasted to that of B. In *List 4* are given all instances of unique A readings.

List 4

121 *ἐανταῖς*] *εαντοις* A
 411 *πρὸς Μωυσῆν*] *τω μωυσει* A
 59 *μεριμνάτωσαν* 2°] *-μνασθωσαν* A
 615 *Ἰλαδ*] *ιαωαδι* A
 623 *Ἀβιούδ*] *αβισουρ* A

628 *ἦ*] *εν* A = *℣*
 75 *αὐτῶν*] *αυτης* A
 78 *Ἀαρὼν*] *αρων* A*
 719 *Αἰγύπτου* 1°] *του ποταμου* A
 722 *αὐτῶν* 2°] *αυτω* A*

83 σου 5°] ∩ 6° A*	2324 καθαιρέσει] pr και A
83 σου 6°] + και εν τοις φρεσιν σου A: cf supra	2413 om και Ἰησοῦς A*
85 ἀνάγαγε] συναγαγε A	2418 ἦν] εκαθητο A
86 ό] η A	256 εἰς 2°] pr και A
87 γῆν] pr πασαν A	258 δεικνύω] διγνύω A
88 εὔξασθε] ευξε A	2533 ἐν τῇ λυχνίᾳ] εκ της λυχνιας A
93 ιδού] ειδου A*(vid)	262 om πάσαις A
918 ὤω] υῶ A	263 om ἐξ ἀλλήλων A = ℞
919 ἐστίν] εισιν A	2618 τοῦ 1°] τους A*
928 om και πῦρ A* = ℞	2620 τὸ πρὸς νότον] ad fin tr A
929 κύριον] τον θῦν εις τον οὐνον A	2711 χαλκαῖ] -κοι A*(vid)
1013 om ἄνεμον A	2714 τρεῖς 1° 2°] τρις A
1110 ἐξαποστεῖλαι] εξαπεστ. A	2717 ἀργυρίῳ] -ραι A
1210 ἀπολείψετε] -ψεσθε A	281 υἱοῦς 2°] pr τους A
1214 om νόμιμον αἰώνιον A	2811 ἐπί] pr διαγλυψεις A
1237 om τῆς A(l)	2827 ποδῆρη ὄλον] tr A
1239 και οὐκ] ου γαρ A	291 ἐν] αμωμον A
132 διανοῖγον] pr και A; sed cf και ανοιγον 121 68'	293 αὐτά 2°] αυτας A
139 om σημεῖον A*	294 om και 1° A
1316 ἐξῆγαγέν] εξαγαγεν A	295 ἐνδύσεις] + αυτα A
144 γινώσκονται] επιγν. A	2912 τοῦ 2°] ∩ 3° A*(l)
145 βασιλεῖ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων] φαραω A	2919 om λήμψη A
145 ὅτι] pr λεγοντες A	2921 om τοῦ κριοῦ A*(l)
1425 om περὶ αὐτῶν A*	2922 και 3° — ἡπατος] post νεφρούς tr A
151 ἐνδόξως] -ξω A*	3013 διδραχμον 1°] -ραγμα A
1521 ἀναβάτην] -τηρ A	3021 om αὐτῶ A
1522 τρεῖς] τρις A	3023 ἄνθος] ανθον A
1620 ἐξέξεσεν] εξεσεν A	3035 init — θυμίαμα] bis scr A*
1623 καταλίπετε] -λειπετω A	321 λέγουσιν] ελεγон A
1629 αὐτός] αυτο ο A	3227 πύλην] πυλης A
178 ἐπολέμει] επορευθη A	337 om και ἐγένετο A
1715 αὐτοῦ] του τοπου A	3310 fin] + και κατενοουν απιοντος μουση A
182 Μωυσῆ 1°] μυση A*	3317 τοῦτόν] τον A*
1818 σοῦ] ∩ (19) A(l)	341 πρὸς με] post ὄρος tr A
197 τοῦ λαοῦ] ἡλ A	344 ἐλάξευσεν] ελαξευξεν A
1910 πλυνάτωσαν] πλυνουσιν A	3410 om σοι 1° A = ℞
1918 ἐπ' αὐτό] post πυρί tr A	3428 πλακῶν] pr τα A
1922 ἱερεῖς] + δε A	3434 ἐκπορεύεσθαι] -σθε A
1922 κύριος] πληθος A	3510 καλύμματα] γλυμματα A
2010 om κυρίῳ A	3516 comma] post (17) fin tr A
2021 ό θεός] pr εκει A = ℞	3528 init — συνθέσεις] της συνθεσεως A
2025 ἐγχειρίδιον] + μου A	3639 γράμματα] pr τα A
214 om αὐτῷ 2° A	3639 ἐκτετυπωμένα] εντετ. A
2126 om τόν 1° A	387 χερούβ 1°] pr και A
2130 επιβάλωσιν] -βαλη A	3820 ἐποίησεν] -σαν A
229 διπλοῦν] διπλον A	3824 ὑπό] εις A
2230 ἀποδώσεις] δωσεις A	395 τάλαντον] + εν A
	3921 om τά ult A

An analysis of the unique readings in A shows a number of errors palaeographically inspired and producing readings practically meaningless in the context (7²² 15¹ 21 16²⁹ 22⁹ 26¹⁸). Striking is the fact that in contrast to B there are only a few itacisms in A. For ι as ει there is only the doubtful case in 9³, and the reverse has produced τρις at 15²² 27¹⁴. The only other itacism unique to A is -σθαι becoming -σθε at 34³⁴.

A number of misspellings of names are not uninteresting. At 182 *μυση* for *Μωυση* is most unusual. Others are 615 *ιαωαδι* (*Ίωαδ*); 623 *αβισουρ* (*Αβιούδ*), and 78 *αρων* (*Ααρών*).

Change in nominal inflection may involve gender (86 27¹¹ 29³ 30²³); number (75 30¹³), case (4¹¹ 32²⁷), or both number and case (35²⁸). Change in the inflections of verbs may involve voice, number or tense (in 5⁹ 8⁸ 12¹⁰ 16²³ 19¹⁰ 21³⁰ 32¹ 34⁴ 34³⁸ 20), the incorrect addition of augment at 11¹⁰, or its loss at 13¹⁶. Change of pronoun obtains at 12¹ and of preposition at 25³³ 38²⁴. Compound changed to simplex occurs at 16²⁰ 22³⁰, the reverse, at 14⁴, and change in prepositional element in the compound, at 8⁵ and 36³⁹. A relative pronoun is changed to preposition at 6²⁸ without change in meaning.

There are only six cases of transposition in A, but there are 23 instances of a shorter text, three of which being due to homoiot. On the other hand, there are 17 cases of a longer text, of which five involve a conjunction (13² 19²² 23²⁴ 25⁶ 38⁷), the article (28¹ 36³⁹), a number (34²⁸ 39⁵), a pronoun (20²⁵ 29⁵), 8⁷ *πασαν*, 14⁵ *λεγοντες*, 20²¹ *εκει*, 28¹¹ *διαγλυψεις*, a bis scr at 30³⁵, and at 33¹⁰ a bis scr from v. 8.

Change in lexemes are more interesting, though two are simply palaeographically inspired mistakes (9¹⁸ 33¹⁷). The others are 7¹⁹ *του ποταμου* (*Αιγύπτου*); 9²⁹ *τον θν̄ εις τον ουνον* (*κύριον*); 12³⁹ *ου γαρ* (*καὶ οὐκ*); 14⁵ *φαραω* (*βασιλεὶ τῶν Αἰγυπτίων*); 17⁸ *επορευθη* (*ἐπολέμει*); 17¹⁵ *του τοπου* (*αὐτοῦ*); 19⁷ *ιηλ̄* (*τοῦ λαοῦ*); 19²² *πληθος* (*κύριος*); 24¹⁸ *εκαθητο* (*ἦν*); 27¹⁷ *αργυραι* (*ἀργυρίῳ*); 29¹ *αμωμον* (*ἔν*), and 35¹⁰ *γλυμματα* (*καλύμματα*).

List 5 broadens the base for understanding readings typical of A by including A variants which are supported by other witnesses (including versions and patristic citations) up to four in number.

List 5

- | | |
|---|---|
| 213 om <i>Ἑβραίους</i> A*(vid) 121 ^{txt} | 102 <i>ἄ</i>] <i>οσα</i> A 73 |
| 221 <i>Μωυση̄</i>] -σει A 56* 120 | 109 <i>καὶ λέγει</i>] <i>λεγει δε</i> A 72 |
| 41 <i>ὁ θεός</i>] pr <i>κς</i> A F ^b , pr <i>ο κς</i>
HymenHier 17 | 1019 <i>ἄνεμον</i> / <i>ἀπὸ θαλάσσης</i>] tr A 44 121
68' |
| 46 <i>αὐτοῦ</i> ult] <i>μωυσεως</i> A 392 | 1023 <i>ἐξάνεστη</i>] <i>ανεστη</i> A 246 75' 59 |
| 420 om <i>τῇ</i> A 44* 129 628 121 | 1213 <i>ἐστε</i>] <i>κατοικειτε</i> A Sa ² |
| 52 <i>ἐστιν</i>] + <i>ο θς</i> A Aeth ^C | 1214 om <i>ἐορτάσετε αὐτήν</i> 2° A* 53' |
| 521 <i>εἶπαν</i>] <i>ειπεν</i> A 19 610 30 509 | 1218 om <i>ἕως</i> 2° A 46 |
| 522 <i>ἀπέσταλκός</i>] - <i>κς</i> A 82 54-422 | 1222 <i>τῆς</i>] pr <i>απο</i> A 121 68' |
| 523 <i>λαλήσαι</i>] + <i>αυτω</i> A 58 Bo | 1241 <i>καὶ ἐγένετο</i>] <i>εγενετο δε</i> A 121 68' |
| 622 <i>Σετρί</i>] <i>σεθρι</i> A 58-376 130 799 | 1241 om <i>νικτός</i> A* 121 ^{txt} |
| 73 om <i>μου</i> A F*(cprn) 59 | 1312 om <i>τῶν</i> A 52 121 68' |
| 73 om <i>τά</i> 2° A 458 | 1410 <i>προσηγεν</i>] - <i>γαγεν</i> A 29-82 314 |
| 811 <i>οἰκιῶν</i>] <i>οικειων</i> A M 82 56 319 | 1410 <i>οἱ</i> 2°] pr <i>οι δε</i> A 29 121 |
| 813 idem A 82 319 | 1411 <i>ἡμᾶς θανατῶσαι</i>] tr A 72 |
| 818 <i>σκνῖφα</i>] - <i>φαν</i> A 130 | 1423 <i>εἰσῆλθον</i>] - <i>θεν</i> A 29 |
| 820 om <i>αὐτός</i> A* 44' = <i>℞</i> | 1527 <i>παρά</i>] <i>επι</i> A 16 318 Sa |
| 828 <i>θύσατε</i>] - <i>σεται</i> A 707 319 | 167 <i>κυρίου</i>] <i>του θν̄</i> A Arab |
| 93 om <i>ἐν</i> — <i>ἵπποις</i> A* 76' | 1618 om init — <i>ἔλαττον</i> A* 53 |
| 917 <i>σὺ ἐμποῖη</i>] tr A 121 68' | 1624 <i>ἐν</i>] <i>επ</i> A*(vid) 15 75 Aeth |
| 919 om <i>καί</i> 1° A Lat ^{cod} 104 | 1629 <i>τά</i>] pr <i>και</i> A 84 |

- 1629 τόπου] οικου A 707 55^{Lat}cod 102
 175 λάβε δέ] και λαβε A 72^{Lat}Ruf Ex XI 2
 177 Λοιδόρησις] -σεις A 58 615* 343 319
 1712 αὐτοῦ 1°] αυτον A 82 53' 619
 1712 om αὐτοῦ 2° A 707^{Lat}Cyp Fortun 8^{ap} Quir II 21^{te}
 1714 τὸ μνημόσυνον] τον A DialTA 80 Aeth
 1716 πολεμεῖ] -μῃσει A 82 121 Bo
 186 ἀνγγέλη] απγγ. A M^{mg} 318-527
 189 ἐξεύλατο] + κς A 84
 1811 om ὅτι 2° A Aeth Sa
 198 ἀπεκρίθη δέ] και απεκριθη A 29
 1916 γενηθέντος] γενν. A 618 615*
 201 κύριος] + προς μωσσην A 121 Aeth^C
 2010 om ὁ 4° A* Tht Ex 131^{ap}
 2024 αὐτοῦ] αυτο A 15-72 121
 2026 om ἐν A* 121 68' 424
 2129 αὐτοῦ 1°] αυτων A 15*(vid)-381* 344*
 2133 λάκκον 1°] ∩ 2° A 72 16 75 46*
 2212 κυρίῳ] πλησιον A 55 Bo^{A*}
 2216 om αὐτῇ A*(vid) 72 44
 235 συνεγερεις] εγερεις A 126
 2416 om τόν A 19^(mg)
 2418 om τό 1° A F
 2524 ποιήσεις] -σει A 15 458
 2525 om καί 2° — δακτυλίου 2° A 799
 262 πήχεων 1°] ∩ 2° A* 130^{ext} 392 628
 262 τὸ αὐτό / ἔσται] tr A 422
 2612 ταῖς] τοις A 537 106
 2612 τό 2°] ∩ 3° A F 76' Aeth
 2630 ἀναστήσεις] -σης A 19 56
 273 om αὐτοῦ 5° A 458 Arm
 2719 κατασκευῇ] αποσκευη A 121
 2720 ἄτρυγον] ατρυγητον A 376 426
 2823 τοῦ λογίου] το λογιον A 121*
 2830 λώματος] δωματος A F 72
 292 αὐτά] ∩ (3)1° A 29 121 46
 298 αὐτοῦ] αυτους A 118*
 2915 αὐτοῦ] αυτων A 46*
 2921 καί 4°] ∩ 5° A 121
 2921 καί 9°] ∩ 10° A 54-414 319
 2925 ἀνοίσεις] + αυτα A 121 46^{Lat}cod 100 Bo
 2929 στολή] σπηλη A 392
 2932 τὰς θύρας] την θυραν A^{Lat}cod 100 = **℞**
 304 αὐτῷ] αυτους A 53' 121
 3010 καθαριεῖ] -ριεις A 376 85
 3012 λύτρα] pr τα A 121
 3019 ἐξ — χεῖρας] τας χειρας αυτων εξ αυτου A Bo
 3034 χαλβάνην] χαρβ. A 121
 333 om μή 1° A 121
 3313 om ἄν A 53' 59
 349 εὕρηκα] ευρον A Or Rom 226
 3410 om σοι 2° A 121 426 Arm^{ap}
 3420 om προβάτω A* 426
 3429 ἐκ 1°] απο A 56*(vid) Cyr Gl 536
 351 συναγωγὴν] pr την A 376 121 799 = **℞**
 359 om πάντα A 121
 3523 ἡρυθροδανωμένα] + και δερματα αιγια (αγ. A*) A 121
 368 σοφός] + τη διανοια A Fh 29 46
 3622 ἐποίησαν] -σεν A*(vid) 121
 3628 om χρυσούς] A* 121^{Lat}cod 100
 3634 τοῦ λώματος] το λωμα A 121
 3636 om τά A 376 46
 375 om τῆς θύρας] A* 527 121 126
 375 χερουβίμ] -βειν και τους χερουβειν A 121
 3715 πάντες] pr και A 321 121 Arm Bo
 3718 περιηργυρωμένοι] -μεναι A 30 799
 384 εὐρεῖς] ευρος A 318 59 319
 3812 οἷς] αις A 121
 3816 ἔβδομον] + του A 58*
 3819 κρίκους 1°] στυλους A 121
 3826 κατόπτρων] κατοπων A F
 392 τό] pr και A 121
 3921 om πάντα 2° A 106 121
 4018 τὴν κιβωτόν 1°] αυτην A 121

List 5 is also dominated by omissions (36), of which at least six are due to homoiot, whereas plusses occurred 18 times. These concerned the article four times, the conjunction καί three times, and a pronoun three times. The remainder are 41 189 κς; 52 ο θς; 1222 απο; 201 προς μωσσην; 3523 και δερματα αιγια; 368 τη διανοια, and 375 και τους χερουβειν.

A number of phonetic changes are evident from the list as well. Thus λ to δ produces δωματος 2830; λ to ρ yields χαρβανην 3034, and the cluster πτρ is reduced to πρ in κατοπων at 3826. Two misspellings of names occur: 221 μωσσει for Μωσῃ and σεθρει for Σετρί at 622.

Most of the variant readings of List 5 were similar to those of the preceding list. Thus change in verbal inflection involving number, person, gender, voice, tense and mood is witnessed in 12 cases, whereas 14 instances of change in nominal inflection

obtained (change in number, case, gender, case and number, as well as change in declension type). Transpositions occurred five times (9¹⁷ 10¹⁹ 14¹¹ 26² 30¹⁹). One case of change in pronoun was found (10²), and three, of preposition (15²⁷ 16²⁴ 34²⁹). Change involving *καί* / *δέ* constructions occurred at 10⁹ 12⁴¹ 17⁵ 19⁸. A simplex form instead of a compound is witnessed at 10²³ 23⁵, whereas a change in prepositional prefix of a compound is seen at 18⁶ and 27¹⁹.

The following lexical changes are found in the list: 4⁶ *μυνσεως* for *αὐτοῦ*; 8^{11 13} *οικειων* (*οἰκιδῶν*); 12¹³ *κατοικειτε* (*ἐστε*); 16⁷ *του θυ* (*κυρίου*); 16²⁹ *οικου* (*τόπου*); 17¹⁴ *τον* (*τὸ μνημόσυνον*); 19¹⁶ *γεννηθεντος* (*γενηθέντος*); 22¹² *πλησιον* (*κυρίῳ*); 27²⁰ *ατρυγητον* (*ἄτρυγον*); 29²⁹ *στηλη* (*στολή*); 38¹⁹ *στυλους* (*κρίκους*); 40¹⁸ *αυτην* (*τὴν κιβωτόν*).

The influence of the A tradition on the text history of the Greek Exodus is investigated in *List 6* below, where all instances of A variants supported by a maximum of three text groups are given (disregarding other scattered support). As for *List 3* above a text group is identified as such if at least half of its extant manuscript witnesses support the reading. An O reading, however, may include mss from its subgroups; a mixture of these will be recognized as O if a minimum of six mss including at least one O witness support the reading. No distinctions between C, *cI* and *cII* will be made; all will be designated as C. The groups supporting an A reading are placed within parentheses in front of the citations in the list.

List 6

- 12 (O s) *Ἰούδας*] *ιουδα* A 29-376' 107* 458 30-127-343' 134 318 55 509 Arm
 110 (s x) om *οὖν* A 29-135-426 126 56* 628 85-127-343' x 121' 130 319 Cyr *Ad* 185 Ach Aeth Bo^A Sa = *℞*
 111 (O f n) *κακώσωσιν*] *-σουσιν* A F 29*-58-376 500 19 125 53'-129 n⁻⁶²⁸ 730 619 121 55 319 799
 112 (b n) *ἰσχυον*] + *σφοδρα* A*(vid) 29 16 b 44 53' n 619 Tht *Ex* 100^{ap} Latcod 100 Cyp *Fortun* 10 Ruf *Ios* IX 10 Ach Arm
 23 (b) *ἐπεὶ δέ*] *επειδη δε* A 77-550' b 129-246 628 121 646; cf *επειδη* 761 53-56^c 392 55 130 509
 25 (f) *παρά*] *επι* A 135-381' 57-761 125 56'-664 628 30 134 121 130 799
 216 (d n t) *τοῦ* 1°] pr *ιοθορ* (cvar) A F d⁻¹⁰⁶ n⁻⁶²⁸ t^{-46c} 318' 76' Cyr *Gl* 193^F Bo
 217 (b s x) *καί* 1°] $\cap$ 2° A F 29'-135-426 b s x 121' 128' 59 509 Aeth Arab Bo Syh = *℞*
 220 (oI C s) om *καί* 1° A F M oI-135-707 C''^{-77c} s 318 18 59 76' 646 Bo Sa¹
 222 (b) om *ὅτι* A 15 b
 225 (oI C s) *ἐπεῖδεν*] *εισειδεν* (cvar) A F M oI-29'-135 C'' 118' 56* s 121 18 509
 35 (b) om *σύ* A 707 126 118'-537 106 53' 121 Carl 49 Act 7³³ Aeth^R Bo
 38 (O C s) om *καὶ εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτοὺς* A F M O'-58-29'-135 C''⁻⁵⁷ 56^{txt} s 121' 18 59 130 509 799 Cyr *Ad* 237 Arab Bo Syh^{Ltxt}
 322 (b) om *ὕμῶν* 2° A* 15'-58 b 130 Latcod 101
 410 (n) *οὐδέ* 1°] *και* A n 121 59 Did *Hiob* 108.31 Arm Bo^A Sa³
 415 (f) *ποιήσετε*] *-ται* A 707 108 44-107* f⁻¹²⁹ 75 76* 130 319 509
 421 (n z) *τὴν καρδίαν* / *αὐτοῦ*] tr A 15' 108 n⁻⁶²⁸ 30' z
 423 (O f) *βούλει*] *-λη* A 58-426 19 129-246-664 392 130
 57 (z) *προστεθήσεται*] *-σεσθε* A 527 68'-120' 59
 59 (n) *κενοῖς*] *καινοῖς* A 126 19' n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 30 121 55* 509
 513 (f) *ἐδίδοτο*] *-δετο* A 15-381' 108 f 121-392 319 799

- 616 (Ο C) Γεδσών] γηρσων A F M^{ms} 72-426-οΙ-708^c C'-25-54-313-414'-422 85^{ms} 121 76'
646 = **℞**
- 620 (οΙ s) Ἀμράμ 1°] αμβραμ A οΙ-618^c-15-707 25-57'-422-550 125 129-246 85-127-321^c-343
121 18 424 509 646 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ach Bo^B
- 620 (οΙ C s) idem 2°] αμβραμ A οΙ-15-707 25-57'-73-313-422-550 129-246 75^c 30'-
85-127-344 71 121' 18 319 509 646 ^{Lat}cod 100 Bo^B
- 623 (b) Ἀμιναδάβ] -δαμ A M 426* 118'-537 458 321 527 18 509 Phil II 17
- 77 (b s) ἦν 2° — τριῶν] ογδ. τριων ετων (> 30) ην A 29' b 44 s 121-392 55 509
- 714 (b) εἶπεν δέ] και ειπεν A 707 b 392 ^{Lat}cod 100
- 87 (Ο x z) ταῖς] pr εν A B^c 15'-58'-64^{ms} x 68'-120'
- 87 (x) φαρμακείαις] επαοιδαῖς A M^{ms} 970 x
- 818 (C t) ἡδύναντο] εδ. A F 15-64*-426-708 C'-77 413 500-25-52'-54-313' 44' 127 t 121
- 821 (οΙ C n) ἐπαποστέλλω] εξαπ. A οΙ-707 C'-73-25-54-414'-422 n-628 527 630 799
- 829 (οΙ C b) σου 1°] ∩ 2° A* οΙ-64^{ms}-29-135 C'' 118'-537 121 55 59 76' 509 Aeth-C
- 93 (f) ταῖς] τοῖς A 44 53'-246 75 30 619 121-392 646
- 94 (d t z) τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ υἱῶν] κτηνων των (> 120-128') υἱων (> 121) ἱηλ̄ (-λιτων 107') A 29-
58-135 126-413 118-537 106-107' 458' 30'-85 t-84 121 z(-407) 76' 646 Arab Bo^A Sa Pal Syh
- 925 (Ο b x) Αἰγύπτου] -πτω A M 72-οΙ-15 b x 318 18 55* 799
- 928 (Ο C b) om περι ἐμοῦ A M^{txt} O'-15-135-707 C'' b 121 18 55 76' Aeth-M Pal Syh^{Ltxt}
= **℞**
- 105 (Ο γ z) κατέλιπεν] -λειπεν A O-426-15-29*-64*-82'-381 25 44 129 84 121'-392*-527^cvid
z-128 55 59 509
- 106 (Ο C) om Μωνσῆς A M 72-376-οΙ-82 C''(-54 126) 121 68' 18 55 59 76' 509 Arab Arm Bo
Pal Syh = **℞**
- 108 (d) αὐτοῖς] + φαραω A 107'-125 121 68' Aeth^C
- 109 (Ο d t) πρεσβυτέροις] τοῖς (> 707) πρεσβυταις A O''-72 82 135 19' d-125 t 121 68' 55 509
- 1011 (f n) om δέ 1° A 707 53'-246 n 343* 392-527 Aeth Bo^B
- 1011 (Ο b) θεῶ] κω A 15-135-376' 118'-537 121 55 59 509 Pal = **℞**
- 1012 (Ο z) ὅν] α A 15-29-376'-οΙ-64^{ms} 121 z-120 59 509
- 111 (x) ἐξαποστέλλῃ] αποστ. A M 135 56* x 18
- 113 (Ο γ) om πάντων A O-58 16 30' y-318 68' Aeth Arab Co = **℞**
- 117 (Ο C s) om τῶν A O-376-15-135 C''-73 s-321 509
- 126 (d) υἱῶν] pr των A 422 125'-610^c 56 527
- 1210 (Ο b) κατακαύσετε] -σεται A 72-82'-376 126 108-118' 56-246^c 75 370* 55 319 509 ^{Lat}Cyp
Quir II 15 PsCyp Pasch 1
- 1217 (d f x) φυλάξεσθε] -ξασθε A 126-422 d-610^c f-246 134 x 318 59 76' 646'
- 1224 (Ο νόμιμον] + αιωνιον A 58' 131^{ms} 121 68' 509 Arab Arm^{te} Bo
- 1239 (x) ἡδυνήθησαν] εδυνασθησαν A 30-321 x 121-527 68'
- 1250 (Ο z) om πρὸς αὐτοῦς A F M^{txt} O-72-15-29-64' 628 321 121-527 z-120 18 55 59 130 Aeth
Arm Bo Pal Syh = **℞**
- 1310 (x) φυλάξεσθε] -ξασθε A 15' 57-422-550'-761 134 x 121 68' 59 76' 799 Aeth
- 1312 (x) ἥ] και A 72-707 125 x 392 ^{Lat}Ambr Cain I 40 II 2 Aug Loc in hept II 70
- 1312 (Ο b) om ἀγιάσεις A* F M^{txt} 29'-72-135-426-οΙ b 121 68' 18 46 59 76' 509 Phil I 239 244
Aeth Arab Syh = **℞**
- 1319 (Ο d n) συνανοίσετέ] -σεται A 376'-618-707 14'-52'-54-761 19*-108 d-106 n-458 85 527
128* 55 59* 319 509 799
- 1322 (Ο n γ) ἐξέλιπεν] -λειπεν A F O-426-29*-82 129* n-127 30-85 y 18 55 130 319 509 Cyr Ad
268^{Rv} ^{Lat}cod 104 Ambr Ps 118 V 14 Aug Trin II 24 Arm
- 143 (z) om γάρ A F 15-376 129 121 z 59 ^{Lat}cod 104 Aeth = **℞**
- 1417 (f) στρατιᾷ] -τεια A F 29*-72-82 56'-129 30' 121' 68' 319 799
- 1425 (Ο n) ἤγαγεν] ηγεν A F^c O-376-15-135-381'-707 73-413 n-458 392 55 508 Th I 1481
^{Lat}codd 91 94-96 111 Arm Syh
- 1426 (Ο b s) τοῦς 2°] pr επι A F 29-376'-οΙ 52'-57'-313 118'-537 56' 85'-343-344^{ms}-730 527
509 646 Aeth Bo Pal Syh = **℞**
- 1431 (f) εἶδεν δέ] και ειδεν (cvar) A 72 53'-56
- 151 (d) om και οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ A* 15 107'-125
- 1512 (f t) κατέπειν] pr και A M 29-82 56^c-129-246 30'-344 t 318 628 130 509 Did Gen 51.2 Ps

- 233.18 Lat^{codd} 250 330 410 411 Cant^{Mil R Rom Sin Verec} BrevGoth 617B Ruf Ex VI 6(2°)
Aeth Arab Arm Pal
- 1512 (C t) γῆ] pr η A F M 29*-64^c-82-376^c-708 14-52^c-54-57-131-313'-500'-550-552^c-615
129 30'-344 t 121' 55 509
- 1514 (y) ὠργίσθησαν] εφοβηθ. A M^{txt} 64^{txt}-708 85^{mg}-344^{mg} γ-527 59
- 1519 (C s) ἀναβάταις] + (*Arm^{mss} Syh) αυτου (αυτους 46) A M 29-376 14-52'-
54-78-131-313'-422-500'-550' 129 85-321*-344-730 121 628 18 46 59 130 509 Arm Bo
Pal^B Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 1523 (n) ἡδύναντο] εδ. A F 64'-426 44' n-75 85 74' 59
- 165 (n) συναγάγωσιν] εισηνεγκωσιν A n-127 Lat^{Ruf} Ex VII 5
- 167 (n) διαγογγύζετε] γογγ. A 72-82* 44' n-127 121 68' Anast 652
- 1620 (O n) κατέλιπόν] -λειπον A F M 29*-58-82'-376 108 129 n-127 30-343' 121 46 55 509
- 1624 (b n) κατέλιπον] -λειπον A F M 29'-72-376* 500 b-537 n-127 30-343' 121-392 55 319 509
- 1632 (b) ἰδωσιν] εδ. A 82' b-314 56' 30-85-344* 122*-128 55 509
- 1635 (b) μάν 1°] μαννα A 426 126 b 44-610 53' 75*-458 392 76 509 Lat^{codd} 102 104 Aug Ex
62 Aeth Arm Co Pal Syh
- 1715 (O C x) om κυρίω A F M O'-58-15-29-707^{txt} C" x 121' 18 46^c 59 76' 509 Lat^{Ruf} Num
XIX 1 Arab Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 189 (C f) Αἰγυπτίων] pr των A M C"-126 414* 107' 56'-129 121-392 68' 18 46 76 646^(mg) 799
- 1818 (oI C) om ἀνυπομονήτω A* F 58-oI-64^{mg} C"-551 121 68' 59 646 Aeth Arab = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 1818 (z) λαός] + σου A 120'-128'-628
- 1822 (O C b) κουφιοῦσιν] κουφισουσιν A 58'-707-708 C"-126 b
- 1822 (b x) σοι] σου A b x 318 76 319^c
- 1826 (b x) ἐπί] προς A 126 b x 121 68' Lat^{Aug} Loc in hept II 95 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 1827 (s) ἐαυτοῦ γαμβρόν] tr A M 426^c 130-321-343' 18; cf also the popular variant γαμ. αυτου
- 1911 (O d f) om τό 2° A 58'-381' 25*-52-73-413 d 53'-56* 730 527 Cyr Gl 501 Aeth
- 1920 (O C) om τό 2° A F 58'-381'-707 C-57-126*-414' 106-125 53'
- 2010 (f z) ὁ υἱός] οι (> 707 319) υιοι A* 82'-376 53'-56 127 121-527 68'-120' 55* 76' 424
799
- 212 (d t x) ἀπελεύσεται ἐλευθερός] εξαποστελεις αυτον ελευθερον A F 29 d 56^{txt} t x 121-392
68' 59 509 799 Aeth Bo^A
- 2113 (d n t) παρέδωκεν] + αυτον (αυτω Phil I ap) A Fa 29-58 d n-75 t Phil I 255^{te} III 121 Isid
813 Lat^{cod} 100 Ambr Cain II 15 Hi C Pel I 34 Co
- 2115 (b n) om αὐτοῦ 2° A* 707 25^{txt}-126 b 53' n 730* 619 318 628 76 799 Phil III 127 Lat^{Ruf}
Rom V 1
- 2119 (b) ἐάν] + δε A 707 551* 118'-537 53' 121 68'-128 59 509 799 Bo
- 2122 (z) ἄν] εαν A F 58-82 77 56' z 59 424 426
- 223 (z) ἀνταποθανεῖται] αποθ. A F F^c 767* 126-414' z 55 426
- 224 (O) om αὐτά A 15-72-376 25 18 509 Cyr Ad 533^P Eus VIII 2.131 Lat^{Spec} 74 Aeth Arm
Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 228 (x) om μή 2° A 376 x
- 229 (b) οὖν] ου A 29 b 392
- 2220 (b f x) θεοῖς] + ετεροις A b f-56* x 527 128'-628 426 646 Act Ph 34 Cyr IX 725 960 Eus
II 764 Or I 41 Lat^{cod} 103(vid) Co
- 2230 (O) μητέρα] + (*Syh) αυτου A 15-72-376 318 76' Aeth Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 2231 (b t z) ἀπορρίψατε] -ψετε (cvar) A F F^b 15-58 b 107' 56 127 t 392 120'-128' 646 Co Syh
- 2318 (b s z) ἔθνη] pr τα A 767 b 246 s z(-128) 76' 424 Sa
- 2318 (C s) θύσεις] θυμιασεις A* C" 44 30'-85-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-343' 68' Tht Ex 137^{ap}
- 2322 (oI C b) om ἀκοη A F M oI-29 C"-131^c b 125 56* 458 318 68' 46 59 424 509 Aeth Syh
- 2325 (n s x) καί 3°] ∩ 4° A* 15-707^{txt}(vid)-767 n 30-85^{txt}-130-321-343'-730* x 527 Phil Ex
II 18 Lat^{cod} 102 Spec 44 Arm Bo^B Sa Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 2328 (b n z) ἐκβαλεῖ] -λω A 126 b n-127 128'-407-628 424 426 646 Bo
- 257 (f) ποιήσεις] -σης A 707-708 56-246*-664 392*
- 2510 (s) om χρουσά A 29' 127* s 84^{txt} 68'-126 76*
- 2514 (O b x) κιβωτοῦ] διαθηκης A F M 58-oI'-15 707^c b x 527 122 46 55 59 76' 424 509 Lat^{cod}
102 Aeth^C Bo Syh
- 2519 (s) χερουβίμ 1°] -βειν A F M 707 129 30-85-130-343' 46 509

- 2526 (*b s*) om *ἐν αὐτοῖς* A* F 29'-58' *b s* 527 68'-126 59 509^{Lat}cod 102 Aug Ex 106 Aeth Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 2531 (*b x*) om *δέ* A F 29' *b x* 68' 59 76' 509 Cyr Ad 605^{Lat}cod 102 Aeth Arm Bo^A
- 2531 (O C *b*) om *τῆς λυχνίας* 2° A 58'-οΙ C'' *b* 646 Cyr Ad 605^{Lat}codd 100 102 103 Aeth
- 2533 (*d n t*) *καρυίσκους*] + *εν τω* (> A 106 75) *καλαμισκω τω ενι* A M 767 106-125' *n t* 18 46
- 2534 (O *d n*) *ἐξ αὐτῆς* 1°] $\cap$ 2° A O'-58'-29 73 314 *d* (-610) 246 *n*-127 30 84-370 619 59 509 799^{Lat}codd 95 96 100 102 103
- 267 (C *t x*) *σκέπην*] -*πειν* A F 15-29-64' 25-57'-73'-313^c-414'-422 19' *t x* 426^{Lat}Aug Ex 108 CLXXVII 3 4 Aeth Syh
- 269 (C *f z*) *αὐτό* 1°] $\cap$ 2° A* 73'-413-550^{txt} 314 44 53'-56 318 68'-120-128 18 799
- 2611 (*d n t*) *ἔσται*] *εσονται* A M^{ms} 767 *d n t* Arm Bo^B
- 2613 (*b*) *δέρρεων* 1°] $\cap$ 2° A F 58 118'-537 392 59 Aeth Bo^{AcB}
- 2624 (*x*) *σύμβλησιν*] -*βολην* A 129 *x*
- 271 (O *s*) om *τό* 1° A F M 15'-29-58-376 56-129 *s* 318 18 46 55 59 509 799 = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 271 (C *s*) om *τό* 2° A F M 29-64'-72-82 C'-77⁵⁵²-54-313-422 56 *s* 318 126 18 46 55 59 509 799 = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 275 (*b z*) om *τοῦ* 2° A 72 25* *b z*-126 426
- 2711 (*b*) *εἴκοσι* 1°] $\cap$ 2° A* 73*-761 118'-537 Aeth-CG
- 283 (*n*) *ἐνέπλησα*] -*σας* A 54-414' *n*-127^{Lat}cod 100
- 2820 (*b*) om *ἐν χρυσῷ* A* *b* 121 Arm
- 2821 (*b*) *κατά* 1°] pr *κατα τας* (> *b*) *γενεσεις αυτων* A *b* 121
- 2839 (*b*) *πρὸς ἑαυτούς*] *εφ εαυτοῖς* A 29 14 *b*-537^c 44-610* 75 46 59 426
- 293 (*d z*) *κανοῦν*] *κανου* A *d* 121-392* *z*-126¹²⁸ 426^c
- 2910 (*n x*) *μαρτυρίου* 2°] $\cap$ (11) A 54 106 53 *n*-127 134 *x*^{Lat}cod 100
- 2912 (*f x*) om *πάν* A 72-618 25-761 53'-246 *x*-527 426 509 799 Aeth^{PR} Arab
- 2917 (*z*) om *ὑδατι* A* F 29' 527 121' 68'-120'-126-128 46 59 426 509^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 100 Aeth Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 2936 (*z*) *αὐτό* 1°] $\cap$ 2° A* 52'-313' 121 68'-120'-126 Aeth
- 2940 (*z*) *τῷ τετάρτῳ*] *του τεταρτου* (-*ρω* A^c) A 68'-120'
- 307 (*d n x*) *ἐπισκευάζῃ*] -*ζει* A 58-707* 14-131-739 19' 44'-610 56*-246 *n*-127 30 84*-134 *x*-527 628 18 426 799
- 308 (*s x*) om *διὰ παντός* A* F 29 *s* (-30) 71'-527(1°) 121 46 59 319 426 509^{Lat}Aug Ex 133 Aeth Bo Syh^{txt} = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3010 (*b d f*) *κυρίῳ*] pr *τω* A 25 *b d f*-129 84 121 799 Cyr Ad 617
- 3014 (*b*) om *τὴν* 2° A *b* 121 = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3015 (*b y*) *ἐλαττονήσει*] -*νωσει* A F 82 *b* 129 *y*-318 55
- 3025 (*x*) om *ἐλαιον* 1° A* *x*-527
- 3033 (*f*) om *αὐτοῦ* 2° A 53'-129
- 3111 (οΙ *b*) *ἐνετειλάμην*] *εντεταλμαι* A οΙ-707 *b* 527
- 3114 (O *b*) om *τουτο* A O'-767-707^I *b* 53' 121 59 426^{Lat}cod 100 Hi *Ezech* VI 20 Aeth Syh
- 3114 (*b*) *ἔστιν*] *εσται* A *b* 55
- 3115 (*b*) *ἔς*] *οστις* A 761 *b* 30 84
- 3115 (O *t*) *τῇ ἐβδόμῃ* 2°] *του σαββατου* A F^b M O'-767-29-64'-707^I 44' *t* 527 121' 18 46 319 509^{Lat}cod 104 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 325 (*b f z*) om *τοῦ* A F(vid) M^{txt} 29-708 *b f* 134 318 *z* 18 46 799
- 3211 (*x*) om *κυρίου* A *x*-527 Aeth-P
- 3220 (O) om *αὐτόν* 1° A 29-72-οΙ 121' 46 59 509 Phil II 35^{Lat}cod 103 Arm = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3220 (οΙ *y*) om *αὐτόν* 2° A οΙ *y*-318 Phil II 35 = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 3227 (*d s*) *ἑαυτοῦ ῥομφαίαν*] tr A F M' 58-64^c-708 106-107-610^{cpr}m *s*-30' 84-134 318; cf also the popular variant *ρομφ. αυτου*
- 332 (οΙ *t z*) *τόν* 2°] pr *τον χαναναιον και* A F M' οΙ-29 107' *t* 527 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509^{Lat}Aug Ex 150 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh
- 335 (*z*) *ἐπαγάγω*] *εγω επαγω* A 29 121 68'-120' 46; cf also pr *εγω* F οΙ-82 C'-57 *s* 318 319 646
- 3315 (*b x*) *πορεύῃ*] *συμπορευση* A 72 *b* 44 53' 74-76 *x* 18 Phil II 301^{ap} Cyr VI 648
- 349 (O C *s*) om *ὁ* 1° A M' 29-58-376-οΙ C'' *s* 121' 68' 18 46 59 319 509
- 3410 (*x*) om *πρὸς Μωυσην* A* 58 *x*-527 121^{Lat}cod 103 = $\mathfrak{M}$

- 3415 (O b) θῆς] διαθη A M' O⁻⁷⁶⁷ 14 b 246 18 319
 3416 (O z) δῶς] δώσεις A O⁻⁷⁶⁷-82 129-246 121 126-128'-407-628 55 509
 3416 (b) ἐκπορνεύσασιν 1°] -σουσιν A 767 b 44 121 46 799 ^{Lat}cod 103
 3425 (x) θύματα] θυμαμα A 376 56' x⁻⁵²⁷ 121*(vid) 799
 3429 (C s y) om δύο A F M' 29 C'' s y⁻³¹⁸ 68' 18 46 59 319 509
 352 (n) ἀνάπανσις] -σεις A n⁻¹²⁷ 122* 55 799
 356 (O x) om διανενησμένον A* F O⁽⁻⁷⁶⁷⁾ x⁻⁵²⁷ 121' 509 ^{Lat}Ruf Ex XIII 1 3 Aeth Arab Bo Syh
 3514 (C b s) καί 1°] (15) 1° A*(vid) F M' 29-58 C'' b s^{-30'} 121' 18 46 59 319 509 Aeth Bo
 3522 (b) γυναικῶν] + αὐτῶν A b 75 121 ^{Lat}Ruf Ex XIII 5
 3529 (O d t) καί 2°] η A O⁽⁻⁷²⁾-29 d⁻⁴⁴ t 121 46 55 319 426 509 Bo
 3534 (f x) om γε A F^b 58-707* 73*-77 106 53'-56^c x 121 126 46
 3535 (O b x) om καὶ συνέσεως A O' 118'-537 x⁻⁵²⁷ 121 126-128 59 426 509 Aeth Bo Syh
 361 (b f x) καθήκοντα] pr τα A 29-82 422 118'-537 56'-664 84 x⁻⁵²⁷ 121 46 55 319 799
 367 (O n y) προσκατέλιπον] -λειπον A 376-767-οII⁻¹⁵ 129 n 30-343' 71 y 55 319 509
 368 (x) ἐποίησεν] -σαν A x⁻⁵²⁷ Aeth
 3615 (O b x) λόγιον] pr (※G; + ※Syh^T) το A F^b O⁻⁷² 25 118'-537 x⁻⁵²⁷ 392 59 Bo Syh = ^W
 3615 (b z) ποικιλία] -λιας A M' 29 118'-537 127 121' 68'-120' 18 46 319
 3631 (O) ἀδιάλυτον] διαλυτον A 15-72-οI 121
 376 (C s) κεφαλίδας] -λας A C'' s
 3714 (b) αὐλαῖται] πύλαι (+ αι A) A 707 118'-537 121
 381 (O b) fin] + (※G Arm^{ms} Syh; cvar) εκ ξύλων ασηπτῶν (om εκ ξ. α. A 118'-537 121) δυο
 πηχεων και ημισους το μηκος αυτης και πηχεος και ημισους το πλατος αυτης και πηχεος και
 ημισους το υψος αυτης A F^b F^b O 118'-537 121 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = ^W
 388 (b) αὐτῶν] + κατα προσωπον αυτων A 118'-537 121
 3811 (b) χρυσίφ] + καθαρω A 118'-537 121
 3812 (O y) om τε A F^b O 19' y⁻³¹⁸ 126
 3816 (x) ἐπ' 1°] εξ A 129 x⁻⁵²⁷ 121 509
 3817 (d t) λύχνους] + αυτη A F M' 29 d t 527 18 46 59 319
 3822 (b x) om τό 2° A 707 118'-537 x⁻⁵²⁷ 121 319
 391 (b) χρυσίου] pr εκ A 118'-537 121 ^{Lat}cod 100
 399 (b y z) αὐλῆς 1°] σκηνης A F 64*(vid) 14-73*-551 b 53' 75*(cprm) y 126-128'-628 59
 319 Aeth^{-C} Bo
 3913 (οI) κόκκινον] + και την (> A 121) βυσσον A οI 127 121'
 407 (b) τοῦ χρίσματος] της χρισεως A 118'-537 121 426
 4015 (b) om τῷ 3° A 52 118'-537 121
 4018 (C) ὑπέθηκεν] επεθ. A C'' 44 75 318 426 646 ^{Lat}cod 103
 4019 (C) ἐπέθηκεν] εθηκεν A* C'' 85 646
 4027 (d x) om καί 2° A*(*) 58-82-376 77*-414'-761 d 246(1°) 75' 130^{mg}-321^{mg} x⁻⁵²⁷ 121 126 59
 4032 (C x) αὐτῆς] αυτην A*(vid) C''^{-25 413} x⁻⁵²⁷ 318 46 646

The following table shows the number of variant readings in A which are supported by 1, 2 and 3 groups, designated resp. as Columns A, B and C.

<i>Group</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>Total readings</i>
<i>O</i>	5	23	21	49
<i>oI</i>	1	4	8	13
<i>C</i>	1	12	17	30
<i>b</i>	27	20	18	65
<i>d</i>	3	4	14	21
<i>f</i>	8	7	8	23
<i>n</i>	7	8	13	28
<i>s</i>	3	12	12	27
<i>t</i>	—	5	11	16
<i>x</i>	13	13	15	41
<i>y</i>	1	4	5	10
<i>z</i>	9	8	9	26

In order of support the groups rank as follows: *b* 65; *O* 49; *x* 41; *C* 30; *n* 28; *s* 27; *z* 26; *f* 23; *d* 21; *t* 16, *oI* 13, and *y* 10. This ranking contrasts with that for the support for B variants where the ranked order was *f* 95; *z* 81; *x* 73; *O* 56; *n* 42; *d* 22; *b* 18; *C* 15; *t* 13; *s* 10; *oII* 7; *y* 4, and *oI* 1. Only group *x* ranks high in both lists. The contrast between the two lists of variants can be more readily seen in the following table. The numbers in the columns indicate the order in rank for the groups.

<i>Group</i>	<i>Ms A</i>	<i>Ms B</i>
<i>O</i>	2	4
<i>oI</i>	11	13
<i>oII</i>	13	11
<i>C</i>	4	8
<i>b</i>	1	7
<i>d</i>	9	6
<i>f</i>	8	1
<i>n</i>	5	5
<i>s</i>	6	10
<i>t</i>	10	9
<i>x</i>	3	3
<i>y</i>	12	12
<i>z</i>	7	2

The position of the hexaplaric subgroups should be eliminated from the ranking lists since they were automatically subsumed under the *O* symbol when an *O* ms also supported the reading.

Correlations of interest can be seen by contrasting the position in rank in the two

columns relative to the top score in each rank (i. e. 65 for *b* with ms A, and 95 for *f* with ms B). Possible *o* influence on the respective traditions seems stronger for A than for B; second place (49 over against 65) in the A rank contrasts with fourth place (56 over against 95) for B. It should also be said that 28 of the variants in *List 6* equal *℞*.

Furthermore first ranking *b* for the A tradition is only no. 7 for B (18 vs 95). *C* also ranks much higher for A with no. 4 (30 vs 65) than for B with no. 8 (15 vs 95); in other words the relations of *b* and *C* with the B tradition are quite insignificant. The *s* group was also of little note for B but is no. 6 for the A variants with 27 cases (vs 65), and this is especially important for *z* which occupied second place in B support with 81 (vs 95), and only seventh place in the A column.

The low ranking for the *y* group in the A tradition is partly offset by the strong support of the individual ms 121 which supported the A reading in 89 cases from the above list (whereas ms 318 had 37 instances, and 392, only 25). Mss from the unclassified group with some significant support for A variants are ms 509 with 58 cases, 59 with 47, and 319 with 41. That the relationship between A and 121 is a real one becomes even clearer when *List 5* is examined (i. e. A readings with no more than four further witnesses). Ms 121 supports A readings 35 times, whereas others in the above list are insignificant; these are 319 with 8, 392 with 3, 318 and 509 with 2 each, and 59 with 1.

Chapter V: The Text of Cyril of Alexandria's *De Adoratione* and *Glaphyra*

A. Joseph Ziegler in his thoroughgoing study of Cyr's Commentary on the Minor Prophets¹⁾ demonstrated that the printed editions of Cyr (Pontanus, Aubert and Pusey) are quite untrustworthy, a conclusion which could easily be shown to be true for the works *Περὶ τῆς ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ προσκυνήσεως καὶ λατρείας* and *Γλαφυρά*, usually referred to as *De adoratione* (*Ad*) and *Glaphyra* (*Gl*) resp., as well. Since both *Ad* and *Gl* quote extensive blocks of text from the Pentateuch, influence of popular readings or of a printed edition, particularly of Sixt, is a constant possibility to keep in mind, and this can best be controlled by a systematic collation of a few representative older mss.

Limitation of such collations to the above two works, though only constituting cir. one-seventh of the total extant work of Cyr is easily defended. Both works, and only these two works, contain large blocks of Exodus text, whereas the remaining six-sevenths quote Exodus only occasionally and then only in brief snatches of text.

Of early Egyptian writers Cyr quotes the Pentateuch far more than all others, and through an analysis of his text one might possibly identify an Alexandrian text. Whether or not this might in turn give some clue to the elusive Hesychian recension remains to be seen. Theoretically Cyr ought to have made use of this recension since he was a contemporary (d. 444) of Jerome who speaks of Alexandria and Egypt as lauding Hesychius as the author of their LXX.²⁾

The following representative mss³⁾ were collated for Exodus.

For *Gl*: F = Florence, Bibl. Laur., Plut. V 15. XII Cent.

P = Paris, Bibl. Nat., Suppl. gr. 150. Copied in 1304.

For *Ad*: P: cf above sub *Gl*

V = Rome, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 598. XII Cent, but *Ad* 449—509 was added in XIV Cent.

R = Rome, Bibl. Vat., Vat. gr. 559. Contains Books I—VIII only. Init—220 X Cent., and the remainder XIII—XIV Cent.

E = Cyr Papyri of which only 520—597 is extant, partly fragmentary, VI—VII Cent.

¹⁾ Der Bibeltext des Cyrill von Alexandrien zu den zwölf kleinen Propheten in den Druck-Ausgaben, *Sylloge* (MSU X), 126—138.

²⁾ *Praef. ad Paralipp.*

³⁾ I must here record the great debt I owe to Detlef Fraenkel of the LXX Unternehmen who carefully collated all these mss against the Migne (Aubert) text and also made many valuable suggestions on the material. This study is based solely on his collations, though I must assume responsibility for the judgements based on them.

- a. Dublin fragments.⁴⁾
- b. Vienna, Nat. Bibl., P. Gr. Vind. 19899-19908.⁵⁾
- c. Paris, Pap. Louvre, E 10295.⁶⁾

These papyri materials are particularly valuable since they were written within two centuries of the death of Cyr. The value of the papyrus lies in the substantiation of ms R as in general a better text than P and V. Unfortunately this only applies to Books I—VIII; since mss PV often represent a secondary text, evidence for Books IX—XVII where only the witnesses of PV are available is not as trustworthy for Cyr's text as the evidence for the first eight books. Codex V is in spite of a number of easily recognized corruptions due to careless copying a rather better text than P. This is unfortunate since P is also one of the two mss collated for *Gl*. Only the united testimony of both mss against Exod should even be considered as truly Cyr. It may then be concluded that *Ad* I—VIII provides the most trustworthy evidence for Cyr's text.

B. The collations have been made in order to make the recovery of an original Cyr Bible text possible. In fact, an immediate gain secured by the collation is the elimination of a large number of unique readings which the Migne edition contains. E.g. for *Gl* 392,⁷⁾ where 21—10 is quoted the following readings are eliminated: v. 3 *ἐπειδὴ*; v. 3 *περι*; v. 5 om *τὴν*; v. 5 *ἀνεύλετο* ed] *-λεν* mss; v. 8 om *αὐτῇ*; v. 9 *μοι* 2° ed] > mss; v. 9 *ἐθῆλασεν αὐτον*, and v. 10 *μωσης*. Similarly for *Ad* 253 where 418—20 *Αἴγυπτον* is cited, the following readings of the edition disappear: v. 18 *μωσης*; v. 18 *Ἰοθόρ* 2°] pr *ο*; v. 19 *κύριος*] pr *ο*; v. 19 *μωση*; v. 19 *πάντες*] pr *οι*; v. 20 *μωσης*. These are but illustrative and show how important it is to confirm Cyr readings from the mss.

General guidelines which have been followed in provisional decisions as to original Cyr Bible text are as follows.

1) Codex R is often closer to original Cyr than are PV. Thus in the following variants the text of R is adjudged original. 1₉ *ἔθνει*] *γενει* 64^{m8} b 509 *Ad* 185^{PV} Ach Sa; 11₀ om *ἡμῖν* 246 458* *Ad* 185^{PV}; 11₁ *αὐτοῦς*] *αὐτοῖς* 376 b-537 44 129 z-630 646 *Ad* 185^P 308^P; 4₉ om *σοι* M 72-376-707-οI C'' 44 458 18 424 *Ad* 248^{PV} Aeth-CGR Arab

⁴⁾ Edited by J. H. Bernard, On some fragments of an uncial ms. of S. Cyrill of Alexandria, written on papyrus, *Transactions of the Royal Irish Academy* 29 (1892), 653—672. No indication as to where the fragments are housed is given by Bernard; it is merely said that they were found by Flinders Petrie in some rubble at Ed-Deir and that the editor was commissioned to identify and publish them.

⁵⁾ Published by P. Sanz, Neue Blätter des Dublin-Pariser Papyruskodex des Kyrillos von Alexandria, *Griechische literarische Papyri christlichen Inhalts* I. Vienna (1946), 111—124.

⁶⁾ This is the longest piece (532 D—588 B) but it is still unedited. It has been rather fully described, however, by D. Serruys, Un "Codex" sur papyrus de St. Cyrille d'Alexandrie, *Revue de Philologie* 34 (1910), 101—117. I am indebted to M. Geerard and C. Lagé from the Corpus Christianorum Series Graeca, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven, who kindly sent a copy of the Parisian ms. to the LXX-Unternehmen.

⁷⁾ The citations for *Gl* and *Ad* for the sake of convenience follow throughout, the pagination of PG 69 for *Gl*, and of PG 68 for *Ad*, since these volumes contain *Gl* and *Ad* resp.

Arm Syh; 14₆ om *αὐτοῦ* 2° 619 527 *Ad* 269^P; 14₁₆ *εἰσελθέτωσαν* F^b] *-θατώσαν* A B F 82'-426 75 30 55* 319 509 *Ad* 269^V 272^V; 16₃ om *γῆ* *Ad* 241^{PV} Bo; 17₁₅ *κυρίῳ*] *pr τω* *d* 53' *n*⁻⁷⁵ 30'-343 527 46* 646 *Ad* 273^{PV}, and 30₁₃ *ἄν*] *εαν* 376-707 *f*⁻¹²⁹ *s* 121' 799 *Ad* 344^{PV}. It will be noted that in all these instances the reading of R = Exod, the lemma.

2) In fact, when two readings disagree and one of these equals LXX, it is the latter which is almost certainly Cyr. Both LXX and Cyr are Alexandrian and it would seem likely that the variant text would be a later development in the history of the Cyr text tradition rather than that the variant text be the original and the text agreeing with LXX be the secondary development, though this can not be ruled out entirely.

Thus occasionally R might be the secondary reading and P and/or V represent Cyr as at 14₁₀ *οἱ* 2°] *pr ἰδου* F^b O-15-707-708^c 106 *f*⁻¹²⁹ *n* 85' 527 130 799 *Ad* 269^R Bo Syh; 11₇ *καθότι*] *καθα* 551 125 509 *Ad* 308^{RV}, and 30₁₂ *τῷ κυρίῳ*] om *τῷ* B 15-707 *b*⁻¹⁹ *n* 55 426 *Ad* 344^{PR}.

This same principle obtains when one of two mss witnesses supports LXX, as 21₁ om *τινα* 72 52'-126-761 509 *Gl* 400^P; 22₂ *λαβοῦσα*] *συλλαβ.* *Gl* 400^P; 34 *fin*] + *κυριε* *z* 130 *Gl* 413^P; 12₄ *αὐτοῦ*] *εαντου* 15-58 *Ad* 1065^V.

Frequently a passage occurs in more than one place. If the occurrences disagree in their witness and at least one supports LXX, the variant witnesses have not been taken to represent original Cyr. In each case below original Cyr is taken to equal LXX. The support for the lemma, i.e. for Cyr, is placed in parentheses in the following list.

List 1

- 21₃ *διά*] *ινα* 19' *Gl* 401 (400)
- 21₄ *εἶπεν* 1°] *προς αυτον* *Gl* 401 (400)
- 21₄ *ἡμῶν*] *ημας* 58*-72-82'-376*-381' C'' *b* 53'-56*-246 *n* 30' 74 619 121-527 68'-630 55^c 76 646' Luc 12₁₄ Chr passim *Gl* 400 (401)
- 21₅ *εἰς γῆν*] *εν* (+ *τη* Cyr) *γη* 125 246 509 *Gl* 400 (193) Arm
- 21₇ *Μωυσῆς*] *μωσης* O-58-135 C-126 53' *n*⁻⁶²⁸ *Gl* 193 (400)
This variant spelling for *Μωυσῆς* occurs frequently and is throughout secondary. The *μωσ.* spelling is frequent in the Migne ed., but the mss usually have the LXX spelling.
- 21₉ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* A F O-426-29'-82*-135-618 78-126^s 19' *d* 53'-246 75 *s* 318-527 *z* 59 76' 130 509 *Gl* 196 (400)
- 21₉ *ἀπό*] *εκ* 75 *Gl* 400 (196)
- 21₉ *πρόβατα*] + *ημων* B M O'-15' 77^c 19' *d f n t x* 392-527 *z* 18 55 76' 130 799 *Gl* 400 (196) Latcod 100 Aeth Arab Arm Sa
- 32 *πυρὶ φλογός*] *φλογι πυρος* A F O'-29'-135 C'' 108^(mg) *d n* 30' *t y* 128' 59 130 424 509 Act 7₃₀^{1c} Thess II 1₈^{ap} *Gl* 412 (passim) et mlt patr gr et lat verss
- 32 *καίεται*] *εκαιето* 135(1°)-376 56' *Ad* 232 937 (*Gl* 413) Arm Bo
- 33 om *τί* B 58-376-*oII*⁻¹³⁵ *b* 129-246 *x* 68'-120' 55* *Ad* 232^{PV} *Gl* 413^{FP*} (*Ad* 937 *Gl* 416) Iust Dial LX 5 Latcodd 100 101
- 34 om *κύριος* 2° 618 106 75 619 *Ad* 233 (passim) Eus VI 236 Tht Ex 101^{ap}
- 41 om *τῆς φωνῆς* 413 129 *Ad* 241 (240 469)
- 42 om *ἐστιν* F F^{c2} M 29-135-707-*oI* C'' 108*-118'-537 44 *s* γ⁻³⁹² 18 55 59 76' 509 Chr XI 373 *Gl* 469 X 445 (*Ad* 240) Epiph I 49 Procop 532 Latcod 100 Aeth Syh
- 47 *αὐτήν*] *την χειρα αυτου* 422 106 *n*⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ *s* 74'-370 *Ad* 245^{PV} (*Gl* 472) Ach Aeth

- 48 om σοι 2° 72-376-618* 73-413 44-125' 458 799 *Ad* 249^{PV} (passim) Aeth-CP
 410 om *ἡμέρας* *Ad* 729 (passim) Did *Hioh* 108.31
 412 καὶ ἐγώ] καγω 82 318 *Ad* 729 (249 592)
 416 σου] σοι 15'-618 C" 628 55c Phil II 284^{ap} *Gl* 481 (89 480 *Ad* 252) Ach Aeth Arab Arm^{te}
 Pal Sa Syh
 1211 ὑποδήματα B b f-246 120-128' 130 799 Cyr passim LatGregII *Tr* 9] + *υμων* *Ad* 1065 Or
 IV 183 *Eph* 573 *Pasch* 220 PsHipp *Pascha* 127 157 rell
 1211 om ὑμῶν 2° *Gl* 433 (passim) Arm
 1211 αὐτό 2°] αὐτα M 707(vid) 246 75 321 18 *Ad* 1065^{Pv} (passim)
 1211 κυρίῳ] pr τῷ *Ad* 1065 (*Gl* 433)
 1212 Αἰγύπτῳ 1°] -πτου 15-29-618 25*-52-126-552 53'-56 75c^{pr}m-127-628 x 318-392c-527
 120-128' 646' *Ad* 1065^{Pv} (*Gl* 420) PsHipp *Pascha* 127
 1216 κληθήσεται] κεκλησ. A M oI-29-135 C"-16 118'-537 56'-129 127' s γ-527 z 18 55 130
 646'; κεκληται 59 *Ad* 1065 (*Gl* 420)
 1613 om δέ 2° B F 707 131* b d-44 56* 127 t x 392 120 130 799 Phil I 150 *Ad* 505 VI 509 (*Gl*
 453)
 175 πορεύση] πορευου 19' n-127 527 *Gl* 488 (492)
 1714 ἐν βιβλίῳ] εἰς βιβλίον B z *Ad* 277 X 844 (*Ad* 273)
 1911 ἔστωσαν ἔτοιμοι] tr *Ad* 940 (*Gl* 497 501 VI 688)
 1911 om τό 2° A 58'-381' 25*-52-73-413 d 53'-56* 730 527 *Gl* 501 (497 *Ad* 940 VI 688) Aeth
 1916 ἐπ' ὄρους] ἐπὶ τῷ ὄρει 509 *Gl* 504 (500)
 1917 τὸν λαόν] post συνάντησιν tr *Gl* 508 (500 VI 416)
 1918 καπνός 2°] ατμῆς 707 52^{mg}-57^{txt}-73'-126-413-414'-500^{mg}-550^{txt}-552 b 44 56*-246 n 30'-
 85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343' 392 628 424^{txt} 799 Phil III 57^{te} *Ad* 488^{RV} (*Gl* 500 VI 416)
 1921 ὁ θεός] ἡς F^b b *Gl* 501 (*Ad* 489)
 1922 ἀπαλλάξῃ] ἀπολεση *Gl* 501 (passim) Arm Bo Syh
 1924 αὐτῷ κύριος] κυριος τῷ μωυση *Ad* 492 (*Gl* 501) Aeth
 202 om εἰμι Phil III 161 Clem I 123 *Ad* 492 (409 VI 676) Eus IV 131
 207 οὐ γάρ] οὐ ου *Ad* 493 (412 VI 676)
 208 μνησθητι] -θητε b-537 107*(vid) *Ad* 493^{RV} (passim) LatGregII *Tr* 8 Hil Ps XCI 2
 2025 ποιῆς] ποιήσης (aut -σεις) O-376 C" b 44 f-129 458 130^{mg} 121-527 z 424 426 509 646' *Ad*
 592^P 593 (*Gl* 669) Tht Ex 132^{ap}
 2025 αὐτό] αὐτῷ 376-707 C"-52 77 126 739 537 30 x 46* 55* 76* 319 *Ad* 592 (*Gl* 669)
 2317 om σου 1° A 458 18 Bas II 172 *Ad* 1064(1°) (1064-2°) Tht Ex 136^{ap} Aeth Arab
 327 κατάβηθι] post ἐντεῦθεν tr B 15' 129 *Gl* 529 (passim) Sa
 327 οὐς] ον B 15'-58-767c 246 x 392 z *Gl* 529 IX 749 (passim) Latcod 100 Arm

3) Unique readings are not taken as original Cyr text unless the ensuing discussion in the text of Cyr specifically substantiates them. It is of course quite possible that such a reading did go back to Cyr, but it is rather unlikely. Accordingly they have not been taken as Cyr. These include the following list.

List 2

- 215 Φαραώ 1°] post τοῦτο tr *Gl* 400; 421 πορευομένου] εἰσπορ. *Ad* 256; 121 εἶπεν δέ] καὶ εἶπε
Gl 420; 122 ὑμῖν 1°] + ἐσιν *Gl* 420; 122 om ἐσιν *Ad* 1065; 1210 πυρὶ κατακαύσετε] tr *Gl* 420;
 1214 μνημόσυνον] -συνη *Ad* 1065; 1223 ὀλεθρευόντα] ολοθρευτην *Ad* 1077; 1522 Μωυσῆς] post
 Ἰσραήλ tr *Gl* 444; 1615 om πρὸς αὐτούς *Gl* 453; 1620 om Μωυσῆ *Gl* 453; 1620 ἀλλὰ κατέλιπόν /
 τινες] tr *Gl* 453; 1625 ἐν] pr σημερον *Ad* 505; 175 om τοῦ λαοῦ 1° *Gl* 488; 1917 τὸν λαόν] post
 συνάντησιν tr *Gl* 508; 2010 κτηνός] pr τῷ *Ad* 493; 2024 ἐπ'] ἐν *Ad* 592; 2024 μόσχους] βοας *Ad*
 592; 2026 ὅπως] ἵνα *Ad* 817; 2118 τὴν κοίτην] κοιτης *Ad* 580; 234 πλανωμένοις] + ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ *Ad*
 560: ex Deut 221; 2315 γὰρ αὐτῷ] tr *Ad* 1064; 2316 om ἐν 2° — fin *Ad* 1064: homoiot; 2318
 οὐδέ] ου δη *Ad* 697; 243 ποιήσομεν] -σομεθα *Gl* 513; 247 ποιήσομεν — fin] ποιήσομεθα *Gl*
 513; 268 om μέτρον *Ad* 637; 268 ἔσται 2°] μικρος ἐστι *Ad* 637; 2631 αὐτό] τῷ *Ad* 660; 2633 τὴν
 κιβωτόν] pr καὶ *Ad* 660; 2711 στύλων] πυλῶν *Ad* 640; 2721 αἰώνιον] + ἐσται *Ad* 641; 285 καὶ
 3°] ∩ 5° *Ad* 732; 287 δυσὶν] δυο *Ad* 732; 2810 ἐπὶ 1°] περὶ *Ad* 733; 2811 τῶν νιῶν] pr ἐπὶ *Ad*

733; 2812 ἀναλήμψεται] ληψεται *Ad* 733; 2815 ποικιλτοῦ] υφαντου *Ad* 736; 2823 ἔναντι] -ντιον πῦ *Ad* 737; 2827 ὑακίνθινον] -νθου *Ad* 744; 2912 τῶν] + δυο *Ad* 753; 2913 om πᾶν *Ad* 753; 2915 τὸν κριόν | λήμψη] tr *Ad* 753; 2928 om ἀπό — σωτηρίων *Ad* 753: homoiot; 2928 κυρίῳ] θῶ *Ad* 753; 2933 αὐτοῦς] αὐτον *Ad* 756; 2934 ἀγίασμα] αγια *Ad* 756; 307 ἐπισκευάζη] -σκιαζή *Ad* 617; 3022 om λέγων *Ad* 644; 3034 ἔσται] ἐστιν *Ad* 648; 314 om καὶ ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν ἐργάζεσθαι *Ad* 649; 321 ἰδών] εἶδον *Gl* 525; 3432 αὐτοῖς] + λεγὼν *Gl* 536; 3827 πρὸς] εἰς *Ad* 629; 408 αὐτοῦ] τα ἐν αὐτῷ *Ad* 689; 4032 ἐπ' αὐτῆς] ἐν αὐτῇ *Ad* 692

Out of this rather lengthy list only nine instances obtain from *Ad* I—VIII, which confirms the earlier observation that the text of Books IX—XVII has proportionately far more secondary elements than the first eight books. Similarly the text of *Gl* has also been corrupted considerably more than the first half of *Ad*.

Up to this point the study has stressed exclusion, i. e. the emphasis has been placed on identifying secondary readings in Cyr. There are, however, also certain positive guidelines which are helpful in identifying true Cyr text.

4) If a paraphrase, allusion or commentary substantiates a Cyr reading, such a reading is probably original Cyr.

Ziegler was able to use the commentary as a control on the cited Biblical text of the Minor Prophets.⁸⁾ Unfortunately neither *Ad* nor *Gl* is a commentary, and in the theological discussions following blocks of Biblical text there is very little by way of repetition of words or phrases from that text. An occasional paraphrase or allusion does help here and there to confirm a Cyr reading. The following may be noted.

111 Πιθῶμ] πιθων (πιθ. Cyr) 75 *Ad* 185^R; πειθων 82 *Ad* 185^P; πιθω 381-426 *b* 246 128' 55^c *Ad* 185^V

In this case the three mss disagree, but fortunately the place is mentioned in *Gl* 388 where both mss read *πειθω* which is likely to be original Cyr. Note that *πειθω* is the popular reading also read by B.

218 'Ραγουήλ] ιοθορ (cvar) A 82 57'^{mg}-73-77^{mg}-550' *b* d⁻¹⁰⁶ 85'^{mg}-344^{mg} t^{-46c} x 392-527 76' *Gl* 196 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ach Sa Syh^{Tmg}

The lemma is supported by *Gl* 400, and the commentary at 409 states ὠνόμασεν Ἰοθόρ, εἶτα μετὰ τοῦτο 'Ραγουήλ. Obviously Cyr read 'Ραγουήλ at v. 18.

31 ὄρος] + του θεου F^b M O-64^{mg}-82 *b* d 56* n s t x 527 z 18 76' 130 509 799 *Ad* 937 *Gl* 412 Eus VI 236 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aug *Trin* II 23 Arm Sa Syh

In spite of the double support the plus is not original Cyr; at *Ad* 232 the mountain is referred to as τοῦ ὄρους Χωρήβ, i. e. without the designation του θεου.

48 ἐσχάτου] δευτερου F^b M O'-72-29 C'' *b* d 56*-246 n s^{-321mg} 730 t x γ⁻³⁹² 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 799 *Ad* 248s *Gl* 476 X 816 Or IV 462 Aeth Arm Bo Syh

In spite of threefold support for the variant Cyr must have had ἐσχάτου. The comment at *Ad* 249 reads τρίτον δὲ σημείον ὃ καὶ ἔσχατον εἶναί φασιν, and nowhere

⁸⁾ Op. cit., 137 f.

in the commentary either in *Ad* or *Gl* does *δευτερον* occur; *Gl* 476 also refers to *τρίτῳ σημείῳ*.

410 *οὐχ ἱκανός*] *οὐκ εὐλαλός* 72-426 131^c-313^c-414^c-551 19-108^{txtc} 76' *Ad* 729 (sed hab 249)
Gl 89^{FPc} 480 *Syh*^{txt}

It would appear that Cyr used both readings. In the commentary at *Ad* 480 and 481 the accent lies on the fact that the law is *οὐχ ἱκανός*, whereas at IX 77 reference is made in a free allusion as *καὶ τὸ μὴ εὐλαλός εἶναι* . . .

125 *τῶν 2°*] *pr* *απο* 376-*oII*-15 57-552-*cII*-54^{414'} *b d* 246 *n s t* *y*-121 630 18 59 509 646' *Ad* 1065
Gl 420 *Arab* *Arm* *Bo* *Syh* = *℞*

The variant is confirmed as Cyr by an allusion at *Gl* 425.

1210 *ἕως 2°*] *εις το* 56* *y*-527 68' 130 799 *Ad* 1065 (sed hab *Gl* 420) *Arm*

That *ἕως* is original Cyr is further confirmed by a double allusion in *Gl* 432.

1715 *μου καταφυγή*] *tr* *B* *O*-15 108 76' *Ad* 273 *Lat*^{cod} 104(vid) *Ruf* *Num* XIX 1 *Syh*

This is a complex problem. The phrase occurs in the context of an altar called *Κύριος μου καταφυγή*. Two comments on it occur in *Ad* 277. The first instance has *RV* supporting the variant text of *Ad* 273 whereas *P* has *μου* in both positions. In the second comment *PV* also have *μου* in both positions, whereas *R* supports *LXX*. I would be inclined to take Cyr as = *LXX*.

306 *ἀπέναντι*] *εναντι* 71' *Ad* 616 (sed hab 617) | *τῶν μαρτυρίων*] *του μαρτυριου* 72 78* 71' 426
509 *Ad* 617(1°) *Meth* 158 *Lat*^{cod} 100 *Arm*

Both variants are secondary to Cyr as not only the recapitulation shows but also the comment that follows.

308 *ὁψέ*] *pr* *το* *M^{ms}* *O*-72-707 *d* 56' *n s t* 527(2°) 392 59 799 *Ad* 617

An allusion in *Ad* 621 supports the article.

3010 *ἐξιάσεται*] + *επ* *αντου* *B^{c2}* 129 426 *Ad* 617

This passage is alluded to at *Ad* 624 where the modifier of the verb is given as *ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τοῦ θυμιάματος*. I would judge the variant at *Ad* 617 to be Cyr text.

312 *Οὐρί*] *ουριου* *B^c* 82 *Cⁿ* 527 46 55 *Ad* 648; *ουρειου* *B**; *οριου* 646; *ωριου* 15

An allusion at *Ad* 616 confirms *ουριου* as Cyr.

405 *θυμιᾶν*] *-μαμα* 15-707 85'^{m^g}-130^{m^g} 55 *Ad* 660 664

The commentary at VI 625 seems to substantiate *θυμιαμα* as Cyr; it comments on the fact that it (the sacrifice) ascends through the altar of *θυμιάματος* as a sweet savour to God even the Father as *τοῦτο γὰρ ὑποδηλοῖ τὸ θυμίαμα*.

5) Variant readings within a block of Biblical text which are supported by other witnesses should be taken seriously as possible Cyr text especially when that support

is not a popular reading (i.e. readings supported by at least four text groups). The reason for this is obvious, since within a context copyists tend to remain within the text. Shorter citations are more likely to be subject to other influences. Admittedly this guideline (as all the guidelines) must be used with caution, and if such a variant is not supported by at least one text group one probably ought not to use it as presumed Cyr text.

6) Variant readings supported unanimously in Cyr are presumed to be Cyr if there are no other reasons for rejecting them. Thus at 46 *ώσεί*] *ως* 426 318 *Ad* 245 *Gl* 472, and even 424 *ἐγένετο δέ*] *και εγεν.* *Ad* 256 *Gl* 484, the variant text may probably be taken as Cyr text.

Once the above guidelines have been judiciously applied there still remains a large number of variant readings in the *Ad* and *Gl* materials unsifted, but for which no reason obtains to reject as genuine Cyr readings. It now remains to examine all these presumed Cyr readings so as to ascertain their place in the textual tradition of the Greek Exodus.

C. First of all the possibility of recensional traces in Cyr's text must be examined. In the list below all instances in which Hebrew influence either immediate or mediate might be suspected are given.

List 3

- 110 om οὖν A 29-135-426 126 56* 628 85-127-343' x 121' 130 319 *Ad* 185 Ach Aeth Bo^A Sa = $\mathfrak{M}$ Sam Tar^O
- 29 *πρὸς αὐτήν*] *αυτη η Gl* 392 ^{Lat}cod 100 GregII *Tr* 7 = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 214 *μή*] η A F M 15*-29'-135-376'-oI C"-77* 126 56'-129 s-30' 318' 18 55 76' 130 509 646' *Gl* 400 401 ^{Lat}ClemR 4 Aeth Bo Syh = θ' contra $\mathfrak{M}$
- 311 *εἰμι*] + (※Arm^{ms}) *εγω* A^c B F^b 15'-72-135*-426-oI 126-550' b n-628 527 55 130 509 ClemR XVII 5 *Ad* 240 Tht *Ex* 112 I 241 II 500 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Sa $\mathfrak{M}$ hab אנכי, which *εἰμι* alone can sufficiently render.
- 46 *τὴν χεῖρα* 1° 73 b 129 n-628 x ^{Lat}cod 101 Concil(Cyr) I 5] *αυτην* 107'-125; + (※Arm^{mss}) *αυτου* 843 *Ad* 245 *Gl* 472 *rell* = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 46 *αὐτοῦ ult*] + (※Syh) *λεπρωσα* 376' d-44 f-129 t 71 392-527 76' 130 509 799 *Ad* 245 *Gl* 472 Or IV 462 ^{Lat}cod 101 Aug *Loc in hept* II 17 Ruf *Ex* XII 3 Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ α' θ'
- 47 *χεῖρα*] + (※Syh) *αυτου* A O-29-618 52'-78-126-313'-414*-422 106 53' n-(458) t γ 59 *Ad* 245 *Gl* 472 Or IV 462 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ ó εβο'
- 423 *εἰ — βούλει*] *συ δε ουκ εβουλου* (cvar) F M oI'-15 C"-131^c d n s t γ-392 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 *Gl* 484 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Arab Bo Syh^{Lmg} = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 72 *σοι ἐντέλλομαι*] tr F M O"-82 (707^{txt}) C" d-610 s t-46 121 18 55 59 509 646 *Gl* 516 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 828 *θύσατε*] *θυσετε* M 15-29-72-135 d(-125) 53' n-628 s-30 t-46 x 121 68' 55 *Ad* 196^{PV}: וּבַחֲתָם $\mathfrak{M}$; cf also *θυσεται* A 707 319
- 109 *νεανίσκοις*] + *ημων* A M O"-82' C" 118'-537 d-125 246 75' s t γ 68'-630 18 55 59 76' 130 509 799 *Ad* 201 IV 264 Aeth Arab Co Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 109 *πρεσβυτέρους*] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) *ημων* O'-64^{txt}-15 125 458 318 *Ad* 201 IV 264 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ α' θ'
- 1413 *τοῦ θεοῦ* A B 155 551 s 121] *του* (> 82-426-708 C 246 458) $\overline{\chi\upsilon}$ *Ad* 269 *rell* = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 1618 *οὐκ* 1°] pr *και* F M 29'-426-oI C" 118'-537 d 85'-343' t x γ-318 z 18 46 55 59 76' 509 646 *Gl* 453 ^{Lat}cod 102 Ambr *Ep* VII 5 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ σ'
- 1620 *Μουσης*] ad fin tr B 82'-426 f n 30' x 318' 120-128'-628 130 799 *Gl* 453 VI 512 ^{Lat}codd 102 104 Arm Co = $\mathfrak{M}$

- 1624 ἀπ' αὐτοῦ] αυτο M^{ms} 127 85-321^{ut}-343-344^{ut}-730 799 Gl 453 Latcod 102 Sa = $\mathfrak{M}$
 186 ἰοθόρ] post σου 1° tr B 15-82'-376' 118'-537 f 120'-128-628 Ad 280 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 1824 γαμβροῦ] + (※Arm^{ms} Syh) αὐτον F^{b1} 15-376' 77 19' 53' 458 30' 318 628-630 Ad 281^{RV}
 LatPsAmbr Mans 11 Ruf Ex XI 6 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$; λαου Ad 281^P
 1918 τὸν θεόν] $\bar{\kappa}\nu$ M^{ms} 130^{ms}-321^{ms} Ad 488 Gl 500 LatAug Trin II 25^{ap} Spec 54 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2024 ποιήσετε] -σεις Ad 592 = $\mathfrak{M}$ Sam Tar^O; cf fac Aeth^{FHR}
 2412 τὸν νόμον] pr (※Arm^{ms} Syh) και 15-58 628 Gl 524 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ Tar οἱ γ'
 252 om και 2° A F M 29-767-ol C'' b d⁽⁻¹⁰⁶⁾ n s t x y 68' 46 59 424 509 799 Phil III 27 Ad
 593 Latcodd 91 94-96 Aeth^C Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 253 ἀργύριον] pr και A B O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15' 129 x 128'-407-628 426 646 Ad 593 Arab Arm Bo Syh =
 $\mathfrak{M}$ Tar
 254 κόκκινον] pr και A B 15'-72-376 118'-537 s 128'-407-628 55 76' 426 646 Ad 593 Arm Bo
 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 256 τὸν] pr εις b 392 Ad 593 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2521 om και 3° M O⁻³⁷⁶-15-707 57* b 246 n s x 392 126 18 46 Ad 600 VI 653 Latcod 102 Ruf
 Rom III 8 SedScot Rom 3 Aeth Arab Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}^L$ Sam Tar
 273 om και 6° A F M O⁻⁷⁶⁷ 118'-537 f⁻¹²⁹ s y⁻³¹⁸ 18 46 55 59 319 799 Ad 612 Aeth Syh
 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2710 ψαλίδες B 82-618*-767 f⁻¹²⁹ x 392 76' 799] + των στύλων 414'; + eius Aeth; + αυτων
 Ad 640 rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
 287 ἔσονται αὐτῷ / συνέχουσai] tr B 72 129 55 Ad 732 Latcodd 91 94-96 Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 291 ἀμώμους δύο] tr B O-82' b 129 n 30' 71' 55 Ad 749 Latcod 100 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 2918 τὸν κριόν / ἄλλον] tr B O-82' b 129 n 30' 71' 55 426 Ad 753 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
 3031 om ἀλειμμα F^{b2} O⁻⁵⁸-707¹ 318 59 426 Ad 645 Latcod 100 Bo = $\mathfrak{M}$
 3034 ὄνυχα] pr (※Syh^L) και M O⁻⁷⁶⁷-29-707¹ C''⁽⁻⁷⁶¹⁾ d f⁻¹²⁹ s t 392 z 18 46 424 59 646' Ad
 648 Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

Of the above 33 instances 14 are plusses and six are transpositions; these 20 are clearly hex in character; in fact, of the 14 plusses eight are marked with the asterisk in the tradition.

Omissions might not be hexaplaric, although three of the five are popular readings supported by the chief hex witnesses; these must be old variants at least as old as Origen (25₂₁ 27₃ and 30₃₁). Another (25₂) is supported by over half the witnesses and accordingly says little about textual affinities. The fifth involves οὖν at 1₁₀ and is well-supported including the support of A.

Change in lexeme involves change of "God" to "Lord" at 14₁₃ (a popular variant) and 19₁₈ where $\bar{\kappa}\nu$ is given as a marginal variant only in M 130-321. The third lexical variant is η for $\mu\eta$ at 2₁₄, a popular variant not supported by $\mathfrak{M}$, but occurring in θ' .

Two variants consist of verbal inflections, the popular change of $\theta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\tau\epsilon$ to $\theta\upsilon\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ at 8₂₈, i. e. a future for an imperative. More interesting is 20₂₄ where Cyr alone has the singular verb, though Aeth^{FHR} do read a singular imperative, which probably means a second person singular future indicative as parent text for Aeth as well.

Finally, there are three cases of change in construction, two (2₉ 16₂₄) of a prepositional phrase being changed to a pronoun, and one (4₂₃) changing a conditional "if you are unwilling" to a statement "but you were unwilling" which is exactly what $\mathfrak{M}$ says. The variant is a popular one.

That there are recensional elements here which are non-hexaplaric is possible, but in view of the fact that these are few and in the main widespread they are probably merely early sporadic corrections. What is clear is that there is some hex influence on Cyr's text.

D. In six of the above list the variant Cyr reading is supported among others by Codex B but not by Codex A, seven by A and not by B, and three by both A and B. Since Cyril was an Egyptian writer the relation of his Biblical text to these two Egyptian codices is of particular interest. Since both codices underwent some hex influence it is possible that Cyr's text might be defined as an A related or as a B related text.

In the next list Cyr variants are given which are also supported by Codex A. The ten instances of such in *List 3* (1₁₀ 2₁₄ 4₆₇ 10₉ 25₂₃₄ 27₃₁₀) are not repeated in *List 4*.

List 4

- 110 ἄν B 58-82-376 414' b 125 f^{-56*} n⁻⁶²⁸ 370* x z 130] > 72-707; εἰαν Ad 185 rell
 31 ἡγαγεν] ηγεν A F M O'-135-707 C'' 19' 56* s x 527 18 59 76' 509 799 Phil I 222 Ad 937 Gl 412 Syh
 517 θύσωμεν] pr και A F M O''-15' 376 C'' d s t⁻⁸⁴ x 121 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Ad 192 Latcod 100 Aeth^R Syh
 825 τῷ θεῷ] pr τῷ A M oI C''-25 500 75' s⁻³⁰ y⁻³⁹² z 18 76' 130 646' Ad 196 X 616 LatAug Ex 27 Ruf Ex IV 4 Arab Arm Bo
 124 συναριθμήσετε] -σεται A B 19 44-125' 127 t⁻⁸⁴ z⁻¹²⁸ 76' 424 Ad 1065
 1222 και θίξετε] καθίξετε (cvar) A B M^{txt} 58-oI'-15 708 C''-16 126 d 129 321^{txt}-343' t x y⁻⁵²⁷ z 18 59 76' 130 509 Ad 1077^V (p hab θησετε)
 1413 ὑμῖν O⁻³⁷⁶ 78-413 127 s⁻³²¹ Phil I 201^{te} Did Ps 269.3 LatAug Ex 51 Arm Sa] > 107'-125 59 Bo^B; ἡμιν Ad 269 rell
 1616 συσκηνίσας] -νοῖς A 58^{mg}-64'-381 C''-313* 615 761 118'-537 f^{-129c} n x y z 18^c 55 Ad 505 Gl 453 457 X 653^{te}
 185 ἐπ' ὄρους B M^{mg} 82 f 392 120'-128-628 Aeth Bo] εἰς (ἐπι 118'-537 280^{PR}) το ὄρος Ad 280 rell
 2026 om ἄν A F M 376-oI'-82 C'' b 56* n s x y 18 46 55 59 76' 424 509 646' Ad 817
 2316 θειρισμοῦ B 58'-82 761 f s 392 799 Or Sel 296] pr του Ad 1064 rell
 246 κρατήρας B 15-58 Phil III 42 LatAmbr Ep 65 Aeth^{FHM} Arm Sa Syh] τον κρατηρα 527 Cyr X 440; -τηρα Gl 513 rell
 2531 om δε A F 29 b x 68' 59 76' 509 Ad 605 Latcod 102 Aeth Arm Bo^A
 2531 om τῆς λυχνίας 2° A 58'-oI C'' b 646 Ad 605 Latcodd 100 102 103 Aeth
 2721 αὐτό] αυτον A F M 767-oI' C'' 44 n⁻⁷⁵ s t x y⁻³¹⁸ z 18 46 55 59 426 509 Ad 641 VI 404 405 Latcod 100
 2918 κυρίῳ 1°] pr τῷ A F 15-29-376-oI'-618 C'' b 121' z 46 59 319 509 Ad 753
 2921 om ἀπὸ τοῦ 2° A F M^{txt} 72-82-376-618 14*-52'-313' b d⁻⁴⁴ 134 527-619* 121 z 18 Ad 753^P Aeth
 3020 κυρίῳ] pr τῷ A 58-376 C'' d⁻¹⁰⁶ t 71' 646 Ad 628
 323 αὐτῶν B F F^b M^{txt} 58'-oI'-707 b 68'-120'-126-128 18^{txt} 46 55 59 319 509 Latcod 104 Aeth^{MP} Arab Arm^{ap} Bo Syh] των γυναικων 550'; των γυναικων αυτων (> 426) και των θυγατερων (+ αυτων C 426 Sa) C 71' 426 Latcod 100 Sa; pr των θυγατερων Fa Gl 525 rell
 3429 ἐκ 1°] απο A 56*(vid) Gl 536

Of the 20 instances of *List 4* in which A supports the reading of Cyr two are also supported by B. Together with those of *List 3* A but not B supports 25 Cyr readings and shares five with B as well.

In order to put this into perspective this must be set over against readings in which B equals Cyr; these are provided in *List 5*. Once again the 9 readings of B Cyr of *List 3* (3₁₁ 4₆ 16₂₀ 18₆ 25₃₄ 28₇ 29₁₁₈) are not repeated below, nor are the two shared by A B Cyr in *List 4* (12₄₂₂).

- 216 *αὐτῶν* 1°] + *ιοθορ* (cvar) B M 15'-58-135-707^{mg}-oI⁻⁷⁰⁸ C' 19' 56'-129 s 527 z 18 55 59
130 Gl 400 Latcodd 91 94-96
- 36 *om αὐτῶ* B 15'-707 56* 55 799 Carl 49 Gl 468
- 39 *καὶ ἐγώ*] *καγω* B 15'-58' fz 130 799 Ad 240
- 826 *θύσωμεν* 1°] -*σομεν* B 15'-29^c-58^(mg)-135-426-oI 16-25-52-57-73'-126^c-414'-422-550'-
615^c-739 106 321 74-370 121-527 407-630 76^c 130 646 Phil III 114^{te} Ad 196^P 197^{PR}
LatAug Ex 28
- 828 *ἐξαποστελῶ*] *αποστελλω* B 15-426 fAd 196^{RV}; cf also *αποστελω* 82'-135 s 646 Ad 196^P
- 1214 *τάς*] *pr πασας* B 82 f⁻²⁴⁶ Ad 1065
- 147 *ἔλαβεν*] *λαβων* B 82' 129 x Ad 269
- 1420 *καὶ* 3°] *pr και εστιη* A^c B 82 19' f^{-56^{txt}} 458 392-527 120-128'-628 130 799 Ad 269 Sa
- 1523 *ἐπωνομάσθη*] -*μασεν* (cvar) B 319 Ad 380 Gl 444 Arm Syh
- 165 *ἄν* 1°] *εαν* B O⁻⁵⁸-15' 52'-313' 53'-56* 458 318 130 799 Gl 449 VI 508
- 1623 *ἔως*] *εις το* B 82 f 85 527 120 130 799 Ad 505 Gl 453
- 1624 *ἔως*] *εις το* B M 82 f⁽⁻⁵³⁾ n 30'-85-321^{txt}-344^{txt} 318 18 46 Gl 453 Arm
- 176 *λαδς*] + *μου* B M^{mg} 82 f 318' 120-128-628 799 Gl 488 492 Latcodd 102 104 Quodv Prom
I 56
- 1712 *Ἀαρὼν δέ*] *και ααρων* B O-82 fn z Ad 273 277 Latcod 104 Cyp Fortun 8 Quir II 21 Bo
Syh
- 184 *Ἐλιέζερ*] + *λεγων* B 58-82 19' f 392-527 z 76' Ad 280 Aeth^C Arm Sa
- 1917 *ὄρος*] + *το* (> B* 376 458 730) *σινα* (cvar) B M^{mg} 82-376 422 19' 56'-129 n s 318 120'-
128'-628 55 799 Cyr passim Arab Arm
- 2116 *θανάτω*] *ad fin tr* B 82 56-664 527 120'-128'-628 426 799 Ad 508
- 2116 *τελευταίω*] -*τησει* B O⁻³⁷⁶-82' 129 127^c 392-527 120'-128'-628 426 799 Ad 508
- 2131 *κερατίση*] *ἢ θυγατέρα*] *tr* B 82 b 44 129 z 424 426 Ad 525 Latcod 100 Arm
- 221 *om αὐτό* B 82'-767 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 527 Ad 533 LatPsAmbr Lex 11 Aeth Arm
- 225 *ἢ* 2°] *και* B O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15 z 424 426 799 Ad 556 Arm Syh
- 2230 *ἡμέρα τῇ ὀγδόῃ*] *ογδ. ημ.* B 82 126 118'-537 129 120'-128'-628 426 Gl 436
- 2410 *om ἐκεῖ* B O-15-618*-707 b 129 n⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ s x γ⁻³⁹² 55 509 646' Phil III 218 294 Cyr passim
Eus VI 240 Latcodd 102 et T: 91 94-96 Aug Trin II 25 Arm Syh
- 263 *ἐκ τῆς ἐτέρας* 2°] *τη ετερα* B 82 129 x z⁽⁻¹²⁶⁾ 55 426 Ad 633 Latcod 102
- 2711 *τῷ* 1°] *∩* 2° B 392 46 55 Ad 640
- 2829 *om δέ* B Ad 744 Bo^A
- 2830 *ἐπί*] *υπο* B* Ad 744
- 2839 *ὅταν* 1°] *ως (εως* 58' Ad 749^P) *αν* B O-82 129 127 85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343' 71' 55 Ad 749
- 291 *ἀγιάσαι*] -*σεις* B 82-376 131^c z 55 426 Ad 749 Arm Syh
- 293 *προσοίσεις*] *προσοισει* B* 392 Ad 752
- 299 *τάς χεῖρας Ἀαρὼν*] *ααρων τας χειρας αυτου* B 55 Ad 752
- 2918 *ἐστίν*] *εσται* B Ad 753
- 2920 *χειρὸς τῆς δεξιᾶς*] *δεξιας χειρος* B 58 Ad 753
- 2928 *ἀφαίρεμα* 1°] *αφορισμα* B O⁻³⁷⁶-82 71' 55 Ad 753
- 3027 *καὶ* 3°] *pr και την σκηνην του μαρτυριου και παντα τα σκευη αυτης* B 15 Ad 645
- 3032 *ποιήσεται*] *ποιηθησεται* B 15' C'' f⁻¹²⁹ 30' 646' Ad 645
- 328 *om και τεθύκασιν αὐτῷ* B 15-707-767 500 d 53' 130 t 126-628 59 Gl 529 Sa: homoiot
- 3211 *κατέναντι*] *εναντι* B oII⁻⁷⁰⁷ d 56'-664 t 392 z⁻¹²⁶ 46 55 426 Gl 529
- 3428 *ἐναντι*] -*τιον* B 707 C'' 75 s⁻¹³⁰ 527 Gl 536
- 3527 *om εἰς* 2° B 15 19 n 68'-120' 55 Ad 345 Bo

There are 41 cases in this list in which Cyr and B agree over against Exod. To this must be added 11 from earlier lists, making a total of 52 agreements. This can be contrasted with Cyr's 30 agreements with A.

When these 52 versus 30 agreements are analysed somewhat more closely, however, the contrast is sharpened considerably. These variant readings can also be clas-

sified according to the degree of support they have in the tradition. Thus popular variants might be defined as being supported by at least four text groups, whereas a second class of support would consist of at least one to three text groups, and a third class would contain only scattered support, i.e. no clear text groups but a number of disparate mss and/or versions. Of the 30 agreements of A Cyr against Exod, 22 are popular variants; seven belong to Class II and only one, to Class III. On the other hand, the 52 variants of B Cyr against Exod divide into 8 popular variants, 33 supported by one to three text groups, and 12 with scattered (or no further) support. One might well exclude the popular variants as being relatively meaningless for determining textual relations. Then A Cyr agreements would amount to only eight, whereas B Cyr agreements would be 45.

The B Cyr relation must not be exaggerated, however, since when B variants to Exod are examined, most of them are not supported by Cyr, but an affinity between B and Cyr remains unquestioned. Nor is this surprising, since B undoubtedly was made in Egypt in the fourth century (in Alexandria?), and Cyr was an Alexandrian of the fifth century (d. 444).

E. One task remains to be done in this provisional statement on the place of *Ad* and *Gl* in the textual tradition of Exodus. The unlikely possibility that Cyr might be related to one of the text groups identified for Exodus should be explored. Only Class II variants, i.e. Cyr readings supported by one to three groups (scattered support being ignored) will be given in *List 6*. Class II variants already listed in earlier lists will not be repeated though counted in the final summation. To facilitate analysis the groups will be identified and placed in parentheses before the lemma in each case.

List 6

- 17 (n) om σφοδρα 2° 129 n⁻⁷⁵ 619 68 *Gl* 388 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ach Arm Sa: haplogr
- 28 (b d t) ἐλθοῦσα] ἀπελθ. 64^{ms}-82 b d⁻⁶¹⁰ 321^{ms} t 55 509 *Gl* 392 Aeth^C
- 36 (C x z) εὐλαβεῖτο] ηὐλ. M 15'-58-64' C''⁻⁷³⁹ x z 18 55 76 424 Anast 129 *Ad* 236 *Gl* 413 468 Tht Ex 101
- 38 (n) Αἰγυπτίων] pr τῶν 72-618 57-126 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 619 527 128 *Ad* 237
- 46 (O C s) τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ] αὐτὴν F M O''^{-15 (72)} C''⁻¹²⁶ 44 129 s 121-527 18 55 59 76' 509 *Ad* 245 Or IV 462 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ambr *Off min* III 95 Arab Arm Bo
- 47 (C) ἀπεκατέστη] ἀποκατεσταθῇ 52-57'-77-78-550'-615^c-739-761 44 *Ad* 248^{PR} *Gl* 472
- 54 (n) πρὸς] εἰς 126 n 318 76' *Gl* 417
- 67 (d t) ἐναντῶ — ἐμοί] ὑμᾶς εἰς λαὸν ἐμαντῶ 29 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ t 509 *Ad* 193
- 76 (n) ἐποίησεν] -σαν 376-707 n 392 55 130 *Ad* 260 Sa
- 77 (C t z) ἦν ἐτῶν] post τριῶν tr M 64'-82-135-376 C''⁻⁷⁷ 126 129 t 71 z^{-68'} 18 646 *Ad* 260
- 107 (n) τοῦτο ἡμῖν] tr A^c 376 246 n 30' 318 120-128' 55 76' *Ad* 200 ^{Lat}cod 104 Aeth Pal Syh
- 121 (d) om γῆ 107'-125 53' 84 55 *Ad* 1065
- 128 (d t) τῇ νυκτί] pr εν 29-72 25 d t 509 *Ad* 1065 Syh
- 1210 (oI b x) οὐκ ἀπολείψετε] ουχ υπολ. (aut -ληψεται) M 64^c-72-135-oI⁻⁶⁴ 57'^{ms} b 56* 85^{ms}-343-344^{ms} x 318' 128' 18 130 319 799 *Ad* 1065 *Gl* 420 432
- 1210 (b f) αὐτοῦ 1°] αὐτῶν 707 b 53'-56^c-129 59 *Gl* 420 432 Or IV 186 PsHipp *Pascha* 127 ^{Lat}Cyp *Quir* II 15 PsCyp *Pasch* 1 Sa
- 1312 (f) om ἡ 15 f Phil I 239 244 *Gl* 436
- 1412 (oI C z) πρὸς σέ] post Αἰγύπτῳ tr M 82-426-oI C''⁻²⁵ 552 108 127 30' 392-527 z⁻¹²⁸ 18 46 130 424 799 *Ad* 273

- 1617 (b) om $\acute{o}$ 2° 376 b 610 53' 458 18 59 Gl 453
 1620 (f) εἰσήκουσαν] ηκουσαν 707 f 121' 68' Gl 453 VI 512
 1632 (b) μάν] μαννα (μανα 319) 426 126 b 527 76' Ad 669 Latcodd 102 104 Aeth Arm Co Syh
 1633 (b) μάν] μαννα (μανα 527) 426 52'-126-313' b 44-610* 527 76' Ad 669 Latcodd 102 104
 Aug Ex 61 Aeth Arm Co Pal Syh
 189 (b n z) αὐτοῦς] + $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ 15'-58 b⁽⁻¹⁹⁾ 107' n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 74' 121-392 z⁻⁶³⁰ Ad 280^{PR}
 1815 (f s z) πρὸς με / $\acute{o}$ λαός] tr 82-376 16-25 f s^{-30'} 392 z 76' 509 646 Ad 280 Arm Sa
 206 (n) om τοῖς 2° n⁻¹²⁷ 84 392 Ad 409
 2115 (d) om αὐτοῦ 1° 707 44'-125 Phil III 127 Ad 508 LatRuf Rom V 1
 2115 (n) θανατοῦσθω] τελευτατω 707 n Phil III 127 Ad 508 Or X 47
 2225 (oI C z) πενιχρῶ] + τω M 15-29-72-376-oI^{-64*} C^{~-54} 127^c 392 68'-120' 18 46 55 76'
 424 Ad 564 Co Syh
 2226 (f) ἐνεχύρασμα] -ριασμα 56^c-129-246 Ad 564^{PR}
 252 (b) ἄν] εαν 118'-537 527 Ad 593
 2531 (s) om αὐτῆς 58-767 16-77 458 s 392 126 Ad 605
 2721 (f n t) ἐπί] + τῆς κυβωτου 767 44' f^{-56*} n t 55 Ad 641
 283 (O n) πνεύματος] -μα M O⁻³⁷⁶ 129 n 84 318' 18 46 76' Clem II 17 Ad 729
 2821 (f n x) τὸ ὄνομα] τα ονοματα 58-767 f⁻¹²⁹ n⁻¹²⁷ x 55 76' 799 Ad 737
 294 (d) λούσεις] -σης 313-615 19' d 56' 75 319 426* Ad 752
 3023 (z) om καί 2° z Ad 644
 3032 (f) ἐαντοῖς] αυτοῖς 72-707-707^I 500 53'-56 527 509 799 Ad 645
 3034 (y) λάβε] pr και συ 707 527 y⁻¹²¹ Ad 648 Latcod 100
 325 (b) κατέναντι] απεναντι b 71' 426 Gl 525
 328 (C) παρέβησαν] + γαρ C[~] 321^c 424 646 Gl 529
 3232 (C d z) ἀφεῖς] αφης 58-376 16-52-57-77-78-414'-422-615^c d 321-346^c-730 71' 318 z⁻⁶²⁸
 46 59 319 426^c 646 Phil III 5^{ap} Anast 1792 Ath III 24 Chr passim Gl 273 IV passim
 3827 (b) αὐτοῦ 2°] αυτων 15 118'-537 106 75 Ad 629
 403 (d) θήσεις] στησεις (-σης cod v) 107'-125 122* Ad 660
 4030 (b) δ' ἄν] δε 909 707 118'-537 54 18 Ad 692
 4032 (O n) ἀναζυγαῖς] -γιαῖς O 19' 54-75*-458 71' 55(2°) 319 Ad 692

The total number of correspondences per text group in cases where not more than three groups agree with a Cyr variant from *List 6* in order of rank is as follows: *n* — 12, *b* — 11, *C d f* and *z* 8 each, *t* — 5, *O*, *oI*, *s* and *x* 3 each, and *y* 1. If one adds instances from *Lists 3, 4* and *5*, the ranking changes as follows: *z* — 22, *b f n* — 19 each, *C d* — 13 each, *O* — 12, *t x* — 9 each, *s* — 8, *oI* — 4, and *y* only 1.

Only one conclusion is valid over against these figures: the text of Cyr is a mixed text. It is as expected closer to B than to any other ms or group which is not surprising in view of the geographic origins of B Cyr, but this is only a relative matter. It would be an exaggeration to speak of Cyr as a close follower of the B tradition. It might also be noted that text groups *z* and *f* both rank near the top because of their relations to B, i.e. half of their support comes from *List 5*.

From this study no light has been shed on the elusive Hesychian recension. There is a certain amount of hex influence, though not a large amount, but then that is also true of both the B and A texts as well. Admittedly the choice of the original Cyr text is only provisional, but care has been exercised to exclude doubtful cases, and it is indeed unlikely that a fully critical text of Cyr would change the picture of Cyr as a mixed text with a bent towards a B-type text.⁹⁾

⁹⁾ Earlier it was said that the text of *Ad I—VIII* was more easily analysed in terms of what is original to Cyr and what is secondary than for the remainder of *Ad* and for *Gl*. Isolating

Appendix. List of passages cited in *Glaphyra* and *De Adoratione*.

Glaphyra: 17 11 22 21—25 31—6 18 41—10 13—14 16 21—26 51—4 71—2 121—13 15—16 34 39
1311—13 151—2 22—27 161—5 13—20 23—24 27—29 171—7 198—13 15—24 203 12—16 25 2229
—31 241—13 321—11 32 3312 3427—35

De Adoratione: 18—12 16—17 22 31—12 18 41—4 6—16 18—21 24—26 51—3 17—21 66—7 76
—7 825—28 107—11 24—26 121—16 21—23 33—34 46 1317—18 20—22 146—7 10—16 19—20 151
22—25 163 13—16 22—23 25—26 32—34 178—16 181—24 198 10—11 17—22 202—14 16 22—26 212
14—23 26—36 221—6 11 16—17 19—27 31 231—7 13—19 24—26 244—5 9—10 251—8 16—22 29—31
36—40 261—3 7—10 31—37 271—3 9—13 20—21 281—3 5—17 21 23 26—34 36—39 291—28 31—34
301—3 6—10 12—38 311—6 324 10 3425 3527—28 3826—27 401—9 15—16 27—32

only those variants which occur on *Ad* I—VIII, however, does not yield a different result though the materials are rather sparse. Since this seemed statistically not overly convincing the entire corpus was analysed. The reader can isolate the evidence for *Ad* I—VIII by taking all those instances in which *Ad* 133 to 592 are cited.

Furthermore any influence on the Migne edition's Biblical text from a printed edition such as Sixt is irrelevant to the above study since the text of Cyr is based only on the manuscript collations for *Ad* and *Gl* (though for the occasional citation of other Cyr support Migne is cited; this is, however, only cited as supportive evidence for *Ad* and *Gl* readings).

Chapter VI: The Composition of Exod 35 to 40¹⁾

The last six chapters of Exodus in **ℳ** present an account of the building of the tabernacle in the wilderness; this account (hereafter called B) is a detailed statement of how the Israelites carried out the various instructions which God gave to Moses for the building of the tabernacle and its accoutrements as given in chh. 25—31 (hereafter called A). B is on a global basis largely repetitive; in large part it could be adequately summarized in the words of 40¹⁶ ויעש משה ככל אשר צוה יהוה אתו כן עשה. Much of B is a restatement of A but in past tense rather than in the imperative and/or the future.

There are, however, notable differences between the two accounts as a survey of their contents shows.

Contents of A are as follows: 25¹—9 the people's offerings; 10—22 the ark and the mercy-seat; 23—30 table of the presence; 31—40 the lampstand; Ch. 26: The Tabernacle: 1—6 curtains, loops and hooks; 7—14 the tent of goats' hair, its loops and hooks; 15—25 the קרשים; 26—30 the bars; 31—35 veil on four pillars; placement of ark and table; 36—37 screen for door on five pillars; 27¹—8 bronze altar and its equipment; 9—19 the court, its hangings, pillars, gate screen with four pillars; 20—21 oil for the lamp*; 28¹—4 Priestly Garments: 5—14 the ephod; 15—30 the oracle; 31—35 the robes; 36—38 crown plate; 39—41 coat, turbans, girdles and caps; 42 breeches; Ch. 29 ordination procedures*; 30¹—5 the incense altar; 6—10 its use*; 11—16 the poll tax*; 17—22 the laver and its base; 22—25 recipe for anointing oil*; 26—33 its use; 34—38 recipe for incense*; 31¹—11 appointment of architects; 12—17 Sabbath to be kept. In the above list those which are not in B are starred.

Contents of B: (those passages with no correspondences in A are starred) 35¹—3 the Sabbath commandment; 4—19 the public invited to bring offerings; 20—29* they do so; 30—36² architects appointed; 36³—7* oversubscription of offerings; 9—38 The Tabernacle: 10—13 its curtains; 14—19 tent curtains with loops and hooks; 20—30 the קרשים; 31—34 the bars; 35—36 the veil and its pillars; 37—38 door screen and its pillars; 37¹—5 the ark; 6—9 the mercy-seat; 10—16 the table of presence; 17—24 the lampstand; 25—28 incense altar; 29 oil and incense; 38¹—7 altar of burnt offering and its accoutrements; 8 the laver; 9—17 the court, its hangings and pillars; 18—19 gate screen; 20 pegs; 21—23* general statement on the tabernacle; 24—25 amount of gold and silver used; 26—28* their use; 29—31* the bronze; Ch. 39 The Priestly Garments: 2—21 the ephod and the oracle; 22—26 the robe; 27—29 coats, turbans, caps, breeches

¹⁾ I am much indebted to Detlef Fraenkel for the extensive discussions and detailed help he has given me on this chapter. His criticisms of what I had initially written have led to a complete rethinking of the problem, and I gladly state that its present form reflects many of his insights. Of course I remain responsible for what is said.

and girdles; 30—31 the crown plate; 32—43* the assemblage all brought to Moses; 401—33 all assembled and ordered; 34—38* the cloud and the glory.

It will be noticed that aside from certain omissions which would hardly be part of a B account such as ordination procedures, the major differences are in the ordering of materials. It would appear that ordering of items was of little importance, a fact rather dramatically illustrated by Exod B.²⁾ The difference in ordering in the two $\mathfrak{M}$ accounts becomes clear if the major items are numbered as follows: A has 1. Ark; 2. Table; 3. Lampstand; 4. Tabernacle; 5. Altar of burnt offering; 6. Court; 7. Priestly garments; 8. Incense altar; 9. Laver; 10. Oil; 11. Incense; 12. Architects; 13. Sabbath. The order for B is then 13 — 12 — 4 — 1 — 2 — 3 — 8 — 10 — 11 — 5 — 9 — 6 — 7. The ordering of B is an attempt to make a more sensible logical order in the building procedures. The Sabbath ordinance (13) is placed first, and then after the collection of materials is described, the architects (12) are named. The tabernacle itself (4) is built before its contents, ark, table and lampstand (1—3); the incense altar (8) is built immediately before the preparation of oil (10) and incense (11); then follow the altar of burnt offering (5) and the laver (9), and only after all of that is made is the court built (6), and the garments of the priests (7) sewn. The reordering follows a more rational order for a builder to follow.

Exod A follows the order of $\mathfrak{M}$ exactly, but Exod B has changed the order of $\mathfrak{M}$ radically. It has also compressed certain items severely. Thus the text of 368—34, i. e. the details of the construction of the tabernacle, are omitted, merely noting that “they made ten curtains, each curtain 28 cubits long and four cubits wide, the same (measurements) for all.” The description of the incense altar in 3725—28 is entirely omitted. The accounts of the making of the table of the presence, 3710—16, and of the lampstand, 3717—24, are also much abbreviated. The problem then to which this essay is addressed is How did the Greek of Exod B come into being?

The problem seems to me interesting for its own sake. Too often in the past Exod B has been used to defend theories about the literary composition of the Book of Exodus. This is certainly true of the most detailed study of the problem that I have been able to uncover, that of J. Popper,³⁾ whose interest in the Greek text was mainly stimulated by his desire to shed light on a possible earlier form that the Hebrew might have taken. The work of A. H. Finn on this problem is less impressive.⁴⁾ It was written in defense of $\mathfrak{M}$, and is vitiated by a prejudice against the LXX which makes any conclusions he makes suspect. It is replete with value judgements such as “the Hebrew order is natural, and the Greek improbable” (460); “Hebrew gives a terse and vigorous picture . . . the Greek turns this into the feeble statement . . .” (464); “the Hebrew . . . is clear and free from ambiguity: the Greek is confused, hardly intelligible, and has every appearance of having been condensed (not very intelligently) . . .” (464). Or reference is made to “such utter confusion of the various parts

²⁾ Exod = the critical text printed in the edition.

³⁾ Julius Popper, *Der biblische Bericht über die Stifthütte*. Leipzig, 1862.

⁴⁾ “The Tabernacle Chapters,” *Journal of Theol. Studies* XVI (1915), 448—482.

of the Tabernacle as is found in the Greek" (465 f.) or "the Hebrew is consistent and natural, the Greek confused and contradictory" (466). Such statements do not induce much confidence in a writer's objectivity.

Anyone dealing with the problem of Exod B today must, however, take into account the thoroughgoing analysis of Gooding.⁵⁾ Gooding has subjected both A and B of the Greek Exodus to a close examination by comparing it with $\mathfrak{M}$, and has actually proposed an answer to the problem which this essay poses. It is to his lasting credit that he not only saw the problem but tried seriously to solve the problem of the composition of chh. 35—40 in the LXX.⁶⁾ Gooding believes that the disorder in Exod B is not original but is a later revision of the Greek. He also concludes that ch. 38 is not the work of the translator of the rest of B but rather constitutes an amalgam of bits and pieces of materials from Greek Exodus, i.e. not based on a Hebrew text but on Greek materials. And finally he concludes that the remainder of Exod B was the work of the same translator as that of Exod A.

I propose to approach the problem from a somewhat different vantage point. I should not want to give priority to the question How well or how accurately did Exod reproduce $\mathfrak{M}$, or better said, its parent text, but rather How did the translator(s) make sense out of his parent text? In other words, Does Exod make sense, not Does Exod accurately equal the Hebrew? In fact, I would without prejudice start with a basic assumption which I would abandon only if the investigation led me to do so, viz. that Exod must have made sense to its creator(s). I find it difficult to conceive of the Alexandrian community accepting a translation as a canonical text that was illogical, confused and inconsistent. I have found the translators of the rest of the Pentateuch including Exodus 1—24, 32—34, to be competent, and generally speaking, making sense. Admittedly they were not instructed in modern linguistics, had probably had little experience in translation work, but one ought to give them the benefit of the doubt and presuppose that they knew what they were doing and were aware of rendering normative Hebrew texts into a normative Greek one.

A. *The nature of Exod A.* I have suggested that it might be wise to start with the pre-supposition that the translator tried to make sense out of a parent text which at times may not always have been clear. The general impression one receives from reading the Greek text of Exod A is that it makes a reasonably consistent statement presenting a credible picture of the tabernacle plan.

1. Exod A follows the order of $\mathfrak{M}$. Over against Exod B which greatly shortens some descriptions and reorders the account of the construction of the tabernacle

⁵⁾ D.W. Gooding, *The Account of the Tabernacle: Translation and Textual Problems of the Greek Exodus, Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. New Series 6.* Cambridge, 1959.

⁶⁾ I have not seen the unpublished Harvard dissertation by Russell Nelson, though from a brief summary in a letter I gather that Nelson believes Exod B to be based on a Hebrew text and that Exod A constitutes a Palestinian revision.

and its accoutrements extensively, Exod A with few exceptions does not greatly change the extent or the ordering of $\mathfrak{M}$.

a) There is but one case in which Exod seriously shortens the text of $\mathfrak{M}$. In 28^{22—28} $\mathfrak{M}$ gives a painstakingly detailed instruction for the way in which the oracle is to be attached to the ephod. In the parallel Exod B account, 36^{22—29} (39^{22—31} in $\mathfrak{M}$), is oddly enough remarkably complete.

In A v. 22 is literally rendered and is then followed by a translation of v. 29. Accordingly Origen added from $\mathcal{B}$ the translation of vv. 23—28 and placed them under the asterisk. But after the translation of v. 29 LXX has its vv. 24—25 as an abbreviated account of vv. 23—28 in $\mathfrak{M}$ as follows: “And you shall put on the oracle of judgement the tassel-ties; the braided cords on both sides of the oracle you shall place, and the two woven shields (*ἀσπιδίσκας*) you shall place on both the shoulders of the ephod on the front.” This was apparently placed under the obelus (cf the confused witness of Syh^T and Arm^{ms}) by Origen, and one might add, quite rightly, since it shows a most confused understanding of vv. 23—28 of $\mathfrak{M}$. By this abbreviation all references to rings are removed, i.e. vv. 26—28 of $\mathfrak{M}$. After v. 22 in which the making of *κρόσσους* and the *ἔργον ἀλυσιδωτοῦ* is ordered, Exod continues with a translation of v. 29 and then reverts to the placement of *κρόσσους* and *ἀλυσιδωτά* with respect to the *λόγιον*; similarly v. 25 reflecting in part v. 25 of $\mathfrak{M}$ concerns the placement of the *ἀσπιδίσκας*. Over against $\mathfrak{M}$ Exod has simplified the account by removing entirely the concerns of $\mathfrak{M}$ with the holding in place of the $\mathfrak{H}$ in front of the ephod as being details of construction rather than of instructions for the making of the parts.

b) Exod and $\mathfrak{M}$ do diverge at times in presenting lists (this is much more the case for Exod B as will be seen below). Three such lists occur in A. The first is the list of offerings which are invited from the people in 25^{3—7}. Exod is shorter omitting “oil for the lamps, spices for the anointing oil and for the incense compound.” It also took *שני* “scarlet” as though from the word *שני* “two of” and rendered the phrase *תולעת שני* by *κόκκινον διπλουν*. The word *תחשים* was as difficult for Exod as for modern translators, but his dealing with it (which became the pattern throughout the accounts) shows us how he worked. Again he studied the text. The coordinate phrase was “rams’ skins dyed red,” so *תחשים*-skins became *δέρματα ὑακίνθινα*. The final item in the list is (stones for settings) *לאפד ולחשן*. Exod does not translate the second item at all but substitutes “robe,” translating the coordinate phrase *εἰς τὴν ἐπωμίδα καὶ τὸν ποδήρη*! The translator knew perfectly well that $\mathfrak{H}$ was a *λόγιον* since elsewhere it is correctly rendered. And what exactly are “stones for setting for the robe” in any case? The text remains a puzzle. It should also be added that for the parallel passage in B (35^{5—9}) the translator except for adding *διανενησμένον* as a second translation of *שני* has taken over this list from A verbatim.

The second list is that of priestly garments in 28⁴, and it is completely and correctly rendered in Exod. The only interesting point to be noted is that $\mathfrak{H}$ which is normally rendered by *λόγιον*, is here translated uniquely by *περιστήθιον*.

The final list is the summary of the various things which are to be made in 31^{7—11}.

Exod compresses the list by adding *καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια* at the beginning of v. 8 but dropping the later *כל כלי ואת מזבח הקטרת ואת מזבח העלה*. And in v. 10 for “and the finely-made garments and the sanctuary garments for Aaron the priest” Exod abbreviates by *καὶ τὰς στολὰς τὰς λειτουργικὰς Ἀαρών*. For the parallel passage in B cf below.

2. Aside from the list in vv. 3—7 discussed in the last section above, Exod of ch. 25 is an adequate rendering of *מ* with only a few departures from the intent of the parent text. One might question the adequacy of the term *ἀκίνητοι* in the description of the poles in the rings of the ark in v. 14 where *מ* has the modifying clause *לֹא יִסְרוּ מִמֶּנּוּ*. A problem also obtains in v. 23 since *מ* states that the table was to be made of *עֲצֵי שִׁטִּים* and in v. 24a *וְצִפִּית אֹתוֹ זָהָב מְהוֹר*; this is paralleled exactly in B (37¹⁰—¹¹). But Exod A (v. 22) as well as B omit the second statement entirely and simply have (*ἐκ* in B) *χρυσίου καθαροῦ*. It is clear that Exod intentionally increases the value of the table by making it of pure gold just as its molding, rings and vessels, leaving only the poles to be made of gilded wood.

3. It is in the translation of the description of the making of the tabernacle and the court with its many difficult terms that the real mettle of the translator can be tested. The first of these difficult terms is *קֶרְשִׁים* in ch. 26. What precisely are *קֶרְשִׁים*? In Ezek 27⁶ the word refers to part of the ship of Tyre and seems to mean “plank” (as in Mod. Hebrew), and then by extension “planking” or “deck.” All other occurrences of the word are in the context of the “uprights” of the tabernacle, and thus constitute a problem. The modern translation “frames” is merely a guess from the context. The translator understood from the context that they were uprights from which the curtains covering the tabernacle structure were hung. He also realized that the courtyard in ch. 27 similarly had uprights from which hangings were hung; these were *עֲמֻדִים* which are *στυλοὶ* in Greek, and so he used *στυλοὶ* for *קֶרְשִׁים* as well. These were of course not of the same kind as the *עֲמֻדִים* - *στυλοὶ* of the court for the translator as his subsequent description shows. (Incidentally according to LS *στυλοὶ* actually means “plank” in Hippocrates’ work “On setting joints” 47, but the equation should not be pressed here; the translator obviously did not think of *קֶרְשִׁים* as “planks.”)

For Exod B whenever *קֶרְשִׁים* and *עֲמֻדִים* occur in *מ* as separate items in lists (35¹¹ 39³³ 40¹⁸) the single term is used. Beyond this the long statement on the making of the tabernacle and its parts (36¹⁰—³⁴ in *מ*) including inter alia the description of the *קֶרְשִׁים* is omitted in Exod B and thus the problem of their rendering does not occur.

4. These *קֶרְשִׁים* were equipped with *ידות*. Exod renders the word by *μέρη* throughout ch. 26 except for v. 17 where the rare word *ἀγκωνίσκους* (a hapax legomenon in the LXX) obtains. This is puzzling, but the translator was faced with a difficult word indeed. In the singular it is of course the word for “hand,” and then by extension “side” or “part.” In the plural the word can be used as an architectural term, the meaning of which is by no means certain. It occurs in KingsI 10¹⁹ ChronII 9¹⁸ as “arm rests” for Solomon’s throne. In the description of Solomon’s temple *ידות* oc-

curs as an architectural term of uncertain meaning (KingsI 7^{32—36}) as part of the details of the supports under the laver. RSV renders the word by “axles” (of the wheels), but this is unlikely to be correct in view of סרני נחשת “axles of bronze” in v. 30.

The translator thus had to depend on the context. That ידות could mean “parts,” or “sides” he knew, and μέρη was a real possibility. But in v. 17 this was not possible. He did what any good translator does: he looked at the context. Each στῦλος had two ידות described as מַשְׁלֵבֵת אֶשֶׁה אֶל אַחַתָּה, again an architectural description. The participle occurs only here and in its parallel in 36²² (not translated in B). The root word also occurs in KingsI 7^{28f} as שְׁלָבִים, but unfortunately the meaning there is quite uncertain. From the context in our passage however, he noted that the ידות were . . . one over against the other; the full phrase he thus rendered by ἀντιπίπτοντας ἑαυτοῖς τῷ ἐτέρῳ “corresponding, or fitting each other.” That he should use ἀγκωνίσκους, a rare diminutive of ἀγκών “angle” or “hook” may be incorrect, but it is sensible. Later in the description (v. 19) the ידות are said to have אֲדָנִים “bases.” Each קֶרֶשׁ was to have two bases for the two ידות. Here the term cannot mean ἀγκωνίσκους, but its more usual meaning of “sides,” or as applied to pillars “ends,” could apply. These uprights then had a base on either end, i. e. there was no distinctive top or bottom to the pillars; they could be turned end for end.

5. The word ווים occurs five times in A (26^{32 37} 27^{10 11 17}) and means “hooks” from which the curtains could be hung. In the first two cases the translator does not translate the word but “improves” the account by substituting αἱ κεφαλίδες. In both cases pillars are involved; those for holding up the veil (v. 32) and those for holding up the screen for the door (v. 37). In both cases the coordinate phrase deals with αἱ βάσεις. For Exod A these pillars, in contrast to the קֶרֶשׁ-pillars, had head ends⁷⁾ as well as bottom ends, and it was important to say so.

In 27^{10 11} the word is adequately rendered by κρίκοι; here the reference is to the hooks of the pillars of the court. Later in a summary statement on the metals to be used for these pillars (v. 17), the translator again pictures the ווים as coordinate with αἱ βάσεις, and accordingly has “and their capitals silver and their bases bronze.” Exod does make sense even though it does not equal M; in fact, it makes a more logical consecution than “hooks and bases.”

6. Incidentally the two references to ווים in 26^{32 37} state that these “hooks” were of gold; presumably what is meant is that they were cast of solid gold.⁸⁾ When the translator substitutes αἱ κεφαλίδες for “hooks” this might lead a modern reader to imagine mistakenly that these capitals were in Exod conceived of as made of solid gold. It is, however, unlikely that an ancient reader would have misinterpreted the Greek in this way. In fact, he would realize that the capitals were gilded, just as he would interpret 40^{5 26} where M reads אֶת מִזְבַּח הַזֶּהב and which Exod renders quite lit-

⁷⁾ The use of the diminutive κεφαλὶς throughout the tabernacle accounts should make the reader chary of viewing these “heads” as elaborate capitals in the Grecian mode.

⁸⁾ That is, according to Gooding 21 ff.

erally as τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ χρυσοῦν. The golden altar is the incense altar whose construction is detailed in 30¹–3. It was to be made of acacia (“incorruptible” throughout Exod) wood and gilded with pure gold. Neither **מ** nor Exod B means an altar of solid gold anymore than someone today in referring to a golden dome (at Amritsar or the Dome of the Rock at Jerusalem) intends a dome made of solid gold rather than plated with gold leaf.

7. The term מסך is a word meaning “covering,” and it is used specifically for various curtains screening the tabernacle door, the gate of the court, and even when modifying the veil curtaining off the adytum, though the veil itself is usually designated as καταπέτασμα for the word פרכת; the Hebrew word is used almost exclusively for the veil with the possible exception of Num 18⁷. When פרכת occurs throughout the Tabernacle accounts it is never translated by anything but καταπέτασμα (note that at 39³⁴ **מ** there is a textual problem), so that it has become the technical term for the veil. But מסך is a more general term and it is translated by various terms such as κάλυμμα, ἐπίσπαστρον, and even by καταπέτασμα at 26³⁷ (as well as a number of times in B). Now it is true that LS defines it as *curtain, veil*, and “prop. the inner veil, the outer one being τὸ κάλυμμα” referring here to Phil, but it should not be overlooked that this usage was derived from Exod, and it is methodologically wrong to impose later usage on this translator’s work who was after all the one who first used the word καταπέτασμα in this sense. The word καταπέτασμα is not limited to the translation of פרכת, but can be extended to render the broader term מסך as well.

8. Also problematic is the difference in orientation between chh. 26 and 27. Three sides of the tabernacle are given in 26^{18 20} and 22 resp. as צפון, נגבה תימנה and ימה. The last-named is rendered by πρὸς θάλασσαν as one might expect. But the other two are translated resp. by πρὸς βορρᾶν and πρὸς νότον, exactly the reverse of the expected.

In ch. 27 the court is described as 100 cu. × 50 cu. in size, the long sides being נגב תימנה and צפון, and the short sides as ים and קדמה מזרח. These are, however, interpreted by Exod from an Alexandrian (or Egyptian) point of view where the sea is towards the north; accordingly the four terms are rendered in order by πρὸς λίβα and πρὸς ἀπηνιῶτην, i. e. as west and east, vs. κατὰ θάλασσαν and πρὸς νότον, i. e. as north and south.⁹⁾ It might be added parenthetically that in the parallel passage in B 38^{9–13} (Exod 37^{1–11}) the four sides are rendered from the point of view of Palestine, i. e. as πρὸς λίβα, πρὸς βορρᾶν, πρὸς θάλασσαν, πρὸς ἀνατολάς.

9. Particularly confusing in the account of the description of the hangings in 27^{14–16} is the gratuitous addition of τὸ ὕψος. Just prior to this the hangings on the

⁹⁾ For a detailed statement giving the point of view of Exod A cf P. M. Bogaert, L’Orientation du parvis du sanctuaire dans la version grecque de l’Exode (*Ex.*, 27, 9–13 LXX), *L’Antiquité classique* 50 (1981), 79–85. Popper’s attempt at rationalizing this translation in Exod A by rendering them resp. by southwest, northeast, northwest and southeast has been followed by some scholars, but this is simply wrong.

broad side (εὖρος) of the court are described as “fifty cubits.” In vv. 14—16 the hangings for the כַּתֵּף (rendered in hebraistic fashion by κλίτος) were fifteen cubits, and for the screen of the gate of the court twenty cubits. Obviously the cubits named intend to designate the long side of the hangings. This is, however, called ὕψος. The translator could not possibly mean that when hung they would actually be stretched out upward to that extent. Possibly ὕψος designated the length of the cloth on the loom where height and width contrasted. We would more normally say “long.” The translator knew that these hangings were hung and not laid flat, so used ὕψος (though we might have preferred μῆκος); he could not possibly have meant otherwise in view of v. 18 where ὕψος does mean “height.”

10. At 27¹¹ the translator has introduced an inconsistency into the account which simply cannot be reconciled. There he is describing the second long side of the court which in מ is as expected simply the mirror image of the opposite side. But Exod has (with the puzzling words added in contrast to the first side placed in italics): “their twenty bases were of bronze and the rings and the *παλίδες* (bands?) of the pillars *and the bases plated with silver.*” There is an incongruity here: if the bases are made of bronze they would hardly be plated with silver. Furthermore that the items listed were plated also contrasts with the description of the opposite side. The words *καὶ αἱ βάσεις περιηργυρωμέναι* have no correspondent text in מ (omitted by F^b which is a revised text), and it remains puzzling.

11. The translator neatly distinguished between the curtains of the מִשְׁכָּן and of the אֹהֶל (i.e. the inner vs the outer curtains) in ch. 26. These are both called יריעת in מ, but in Exod those of the מִשְׁכָּן, 10 in number, are called *αὐλαῖαι*, whereas the 11 יריעת of the אֹהֶל are designated as *δέρρεις*. At first blush this would seem to imply that Exod mistakenly took the אֹהֶל curtains to be skins, but this is to overlook the context. מ introduces the subject with the full description יריעת עוֹיִם. Since עוֹיִם simply means “goats” the phrase could be interpreted either as curtains of goats’ skins or of goats’ hair. Exod specifically renders the phrase by *δέρρεις τριχίνας* in v. 7, i.e. goats-hair cloth, well-known to most people of the Near Eastern world as typical of bedouin tents. In vv. 8—10 where עוֹיִם is dropped Exod neatly distinguishes these curtains from the inner *αὐλαῖαι* of colored linen, by using *δέρρεις*. In Exod there is no danger of confusion as there is in מ where the same term is used. Exod distinguishes between the hair-cloth hangings (*δέρρεις*) and the curtains (*αὐλαῖαι*) throughout. It might be noted that in Num 4²⁵ the translator who must have used Greek Exodus for his work did not understand the difference which Exod A had so carefully delineated; for *את יריעת המִשְׁכָּן* he uses *δέρρεις τῆς σκηנῆς*.

12. Ch. 28 deals with instructions for the making of the priestly garments and presented the translator with a number of difficulties. Sometimes these were met in an unexpected way by Exod. Thus the ephod was to be made of spun linen according to v. 6, the ephod being *τὴν ἐπωμίδα*. But then v. 7 continues with “*δύο ἐπωμίδες* (for כתפת - shoulder pieces) it shall have joined the one to the other,” and then v. 8 refers to *τὸ ὕφασμα τῶν ἐπωμίδων* (for אפדתו; did Exod read אפדות?) which were on it.

In any event, the translator used *ἐπωμῖς* in the singular as a technical term for the ephod, but in the plural for its literal meaning of “shoulders.”

At times Exod is quite different from *ℳ*. In v.14 the chains of gold become *χρυσωτά* of gold, and for *מגבלת תעשה אתם* Exod substitutes a free composition *καταμειγμένα ἐν ἄνθεσιν*, and at the end of the verse he supplies a locative for the *המשבצת* viz. *κατὰ τὰς παρωμίδας αὐτῶν ἐκ τῶν ἐμπροσθίων*, which has no basis in *ℳ*.

Instructive for understanding how the translator worked is vv.15—22 describing the making of the oracle of decisions. Vv.15—16 presented no problems but v.17 has *מלאת (בו) ומלאת* for four rows of stones. How does one fill a filling for rows of stones in the oracle? Exod has *καθυφανεῖς . . . ὕφασμα* “you shall interweave a weaving.” Then in v.20 *משבצים זהב* gave trouble which Exod solved by means of a doublet translation *περικεκαλυμμένα χρυσίῳ συνδεδεμένα ἐν χρυσίῳ*. The verse ended with *במלואתם* which Exod rendered by *κατὰ στίχον αὐτῶν* a guess inspired by the context. Similarly in the description of the robe in vv.27—31 (*ℳ* 33—35) the context dictated the rendering of a difficult passage. The translator was understandably bothered by *תחרא*, a word of uncertain origin and meaning. Again the context was examined and for *כפי תחרא יהיה לו* Exod has *τὴν συμβολὴν συννυφασμένην ἐξ αὐτοῦ* “with the junction being woven together with it;” this fits nicely into the context which continues with “that it might not be torn.”

13. The remaining chh. simply confirm the pattern set out in the above paragraphs. Exod is not slavishly bound to *ℳ*, but it is on the whole a good translation. The translator views his task as one of making a credible picture, e.g. of the tabernacle plan. At times he misinterprets but throughout seems to have a consistent picture in mind.

His parent text was close to that of *ℳ* at least in its consonantal structure. In fact only once did he seriously abbreviate an extended passage, viz. 28²²—28; cf 1a above. This ought to occasion no surprise since the Torah had been deemed canonical for at least 150 years by the time the translator worked. The Torah, at least for A, had substantially the shape it now has in the Alexandrian Jewish community in the middle of the third century B.C.E. It should be interesting to see what a study of B will produce, where after all the real problem of this study is centered.

In summary it must be said that in spite of the various strictures given above, Exod A is not a bad translation. The translator sought to put the intent of his parent Hebrew text into Greek. To do that he largely avoided Aquilanic correspondences and varied his translations apparently deliberately in order to produce a more readable text. When difficulties were met he decided on the basis of the context, but throughout tried to create a text which, within the limits prescribed by a context of translation, presents a credible and consistent picture quite in keeping with what was done in chh.1—24. That on occasions Exod was not adequate to the task and even quite mistaken is not surprising. What is surprising is how, faced with a difficult text with many obscurities, he did so well.

B. a. The problem which this essay is to elucidate is, however, that of Exod B. If one simply reads Exod B for its own sake, i.e. as the Greek Bible rather than as a targum of the Hebrew text, it divides quite naturally into four parts. Part 1 ends with 367. The materials for the construction have been collected, in fact, the drive has been oversubscribed; the architects have been appointed. With Part 2 the actual work began; the account characteristically begins with *καὶ ἐποίησεν*. First of all, the priestly garments are made in accordance with the instructions in A, including the ephod with its memorial stones, the oracle with the 12 stones, its ornaments, rings and ties, the blue robe with its clusters and bells, together with linen coats, turbans, miter, breeches, girdles and the inscribed plate on a blue string. Also made were the 10 curtains for the tabernacle, the veil and the door curtain; then the linen hangings for the court, for its gateway and its gate as well as all the pillars on which all the curtains were to hang. The work was done by Beseleel and by Eliab who is specifically described as *ὃς ἡρχιτεκτόνησεν τὰ ὕφαντὰ καὶ τὰ ῥαφιδευτὰ καὶ τὰ ποικιλτὰ ὑφᾶναι τῷ κοκκίνῳ καὶ τῇ βύσσῳ* (3721). The account in Part 2 is basically about the work in fabrics and comprises 368 to 3721.

Part 3 is limited to the work of Beseleel, the master craftsman in metal work. Accordingly, he made the ark, the mercy-seat and cherubim, the table and its vessels, the lampstand. He also did the casting and plating of pillars, with their rings, bars and hooks, and of all the capitals. He made the pins for tent and court, the bronze altar and its vessels, the anointing oil and the incense compound as well as the laver and its base. All this involved a great deal of metal, the amount and the use to which these metals were put is then given. Part 3 is found in 381 to 3911.

That 3914 begins quite a different section is clear, since except for summary statements that they had done what was ordered (3922f 4014) the verb *ποιέω* no longer appears. Part 4 (3914 — fin libri) is clearly the conclusion. Now they (undefined but presumably the Israelites who had been working at carrying out the divine orders) brought everything that had been made to Moses, who on the Lord's command set up the structure(s), arranged all the furniture, anointed what was appropriate, put the priestly garments on Aaron and his sons. When everything was in order the cloud covered the structure which thereupon was filled with the glory of the Lord.

These four sections are discreet literary sections, and each one deserves to be treated separately; accordingly their approach to their task will be individually examined next.

b. But before proceeding to that analysis of Exod B itself it might be fruitful to examine briefly the materials of the two Hebrew accounts. It was noted above that Exod A on the whole followed the materials of the Hebrew A account adequately. This is by no means the case with Exod B for chh. 35—40. Moreover the Hebrew B account also differs considerably in the ordering of events from the A account.

The latter began with a brief account of the materials needed, 25: 1—7, and then orders the construction of ark, table and lampstand (vv. 10—40), only thereafter detailing the making of the tabernacle with its curtains, clasps, supports, bars, veil and screen (ch. 26); the altar of burnt offering, the courtyard of the tabernacle, and the

olive oil for the perpetual light (ch. 27); the priestly garments (ch. 28); the consecration of the priests along with their daily burnt offering (ch. 29); the altar of incense, the imposition of a poll tax, the bronze laver, and the composition of the anointing oil and of the incense (ch. 30). The account ends with the appointment of the two architects and the divine order to keep the Sabbaths faithfully (ch. 31).

The B account is considerably different in the order of events. It begins with the Sabbath command; offering of materials are invited and received, and the architects appointed (35: 1—36: 7). The actual construction is recorded in the following order: the tabernacle (36: 8—40); the ark, table, lampstand, incense altar, the oil and the incense (ch. 37); the altar of burnt offering, the laver, the courtyard (ch. 38), and the priestly garments (ch. 39). The work being completed is now all delivered to Moses, who is ordered to set up the tent, arrange its contents, anoint the structure, and invest and anoint the priests; this is carried out and the cloud fills the tent (ch. 40).

It will be noted that the order of B is from a builder's point of view a much more logical one. The tabernacle is built first before its furnishings are made. The altar of burnt offering and the laver stand outside the tabernacle and are made next; then the courtyard is built around them, and only at the end are the vestments for the functionaries who are to serve within the structure made.

This sketch of the differences in the ordering of the accounts should be borne in mind in the study of yet a third account, that of Exod B, to which we now turn.

C. Part 1 constitutes the introduction to B; it extends from 35₁ to 36₇ and follows the order of *ℳ*. On the whole the section reads sensibly, and as a translation is a rather free but sound rendering. It is not a word for word rendering but shows deep insight into the meaning of the Hebrew and gives the intent of the passage often with fine discrimination. When it has a parallel in the A account (only for 35₁—19, 30—34) the translator shows acquaintance with the parallel; in fact for the list of materials invited as gifts from the people in 35₅—9 B takes over the A account word for word except for *διανενησμένον* as a gloss on *διπλοῦν* in v. 6 from 25₃—6.

In the introductory verses (vv. 1—3) there is considerable freedom over against *ℳ*. In v. 2 there is no translation for “there shall be to you;” this makes good sense since *שבת שבתן קדש* is said to be *ליהיה*. On the other hand, an extra noun obtains in Exod, viz. *κατάπανσις*. At the end of v. 3 Exod adds *ἐγὼ κύριος* without equivalence in *ℳ*.

Vv. 5—8 deal with the materials needed for the construction. The lists in the two accounts are identical in *ℳ* except for two conjunctions. Exod A and B are almost the same, B having taken over the A account. This is obvious from the fact that both lists omit “oil for the light, and spices for the anointing oil and for the incense mixtures.”

Vv. 11—19 contain the list of items which are to be made by everyone who is *σοφὸς τῇ διανοίᾳ ἐν ὑμῖν* (v. 9). The list in *ℳ* is much more detailed than that of A, and in Exod is much compressed as well as reordered. Both Exod and *ℳ* begin with the tent and the ark (in both cases with various accoutrements) but thereafter the order

varies considerably between the two. The remainder of the list in Exod is as follows: 1. hangings of the courtyard; 2. emerald stones; 3. incense; 4. anointing oil; 5. table; 6. lampstand; 7. the altar; 8. priestly garments; 9. anointing oil; 10. incense mixture. The Hebrew order is: 1. table; 2. lampstand; 3. incense altar; 4. anointing oil; 5. incense mixture; 6. door screen; 7. altar of the holocaust; 8. courtyard hangings; 9. screen for the courtyard gate; 10. pegs and cords for tabernacle and courtyard; 11. priestly vestments. Odd are nos. 2—4 of the Greek list. Nos. 3 and 4 repeat nos. 9 and 10 while no. 2 is part of the priestly vestments. But in vv. 8 and 9 of the Hebrew nos. 3 and 4 also occur and were not rendered by Exod; furthermore they are followed by *שֶׁהם* rendered by *λίθους σαρδίου* in Exod; *שֶׁהם* is elsewhere translated by *τῆς σμαράγδου* as in v. 27, and cf also 28: 9 and 36: 13. It would appear that the source for nos. 2—4 is vv. 8—9a of the Hebrew.

Furthermore Exod disregards the incense altar entirely throughout Exod B, having only *τὸ θυσιαστήριον* here. It should further be noted that Exod also disregards the laver. For the rest Exod reorders the items and subsumes accoutrements under main items throughout.

Vv. 20—29 detail the gifts which the people brought and naturally has no parallel in A. It is except for the short lists of offerings in vv. 22—23 a good translation of *ℳ* with a bit of freedom exercised on minor points, mainly involving the conjunction “and” or the word “all,” as well as omitting one of the oils in v. 28, “the oil for the light” (by parablepsis due to homoiot?). In v. 22 Exod has five instead of four pieces of jewelry listed (as does Sam which probably represents the parent text of Exod), but the first in the list is probably a mere guess, i.e. *σφραγιδας* for the difficult *ח* (fibula?). V. 23a is much compressed; for “blue and purple and scarlet stuff and linen and goats’ hair” only *βύσσος* obtains, and in the second part of the verse the two skins are in reverse order to that of *ℳ*.

Vv. 31—34a constitute a free rendering of *ℳ* though it does get the sense of the passage. It deals with the appointment and inspiration of the two architects and a parallel obtains in A: 31¹—6. *ℳ* of 35³²—³³ is the exact equivalent of 31⁴—⁵ except for an initial *ואת* and a final *מחשבת*, but is dealt with quite differently. Exod A shows a textual problem in that it (contra *ℳ*) adds fabrics at the end of 31⁴. If one simply disregards this a comparison of A and B is interesting for its divergencies in rendering the same text. A has *διανοεῖσθαι καὶ ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν, ἐργάζεσθαι τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὸν χαλκόν, καὶ τὴν ὑάκινθον καὶ τὴν πορφύραν καὶ τὸ κόκκινον τὸ νηστὸν καὶ τὴν βύσσον τὴν κεκλωσμένην, καὶ τὰ λιθουργικὰ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τεκτονικὰ τῶν ξύλων, ἐργάζεσθαι κατὰ πάντα τὰ ἔργα*, whereas B has *ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν κατὰ πάντα τὰ ἔργα τῆς ἀρχιτεκτονίας, ποιεῖν τὸ χρυσίον καὶ τὸ ἀργύριον καὶ τὸν χαλκόν, καὶ λιθουργῆσαι τὸν λίθον, καὶ κατεργάζεσθαι τὰ ξύλα, καὶ ποιεῖν ἐν παντὶ ἔργῳ (σοφίας)*. It is clear that Exod B was well acquainted with the A account; in fact v. 31 is almost identical with 31³; nonetheless the translator goes his own way, at times using lexemes from the A account but adapting them to the new context in quite a different way. What seems surprising is that he did not rely more heavily on the parallel statement when the language of the Hebrew is so closely parallel.

V. 35 has no counterpart in A and condenses the rather prolix text of $\mathfrak{M}$ by changing the various workmen in $\mathfrak{M}$ into a reduced number of occupations.

361—7 is a good translation of $\mathfrak{M}$; in fact occasionally Exod has a fine *bon mot* in Greek for realizing the intent of $\mathfrak{M}$. Thus in v. 1 for מלאכת עבדת הקדש Exod has τὰ ἔργα κατὰ τὰ ἅγια καθήκοντα; in v. 2 τοὺς ἐκουσίως βουλομένους προσπορεύεσθαι well renders אשר נשאו לבו לקרבה, and in v. 6 the Hebrew ויעבירו קול is nicely rendered by ἐκήρυξεν.

Part 1 is in general a good translation of a parent text close to $\mathfrak{M}$, though the translator at times does render the Hebrew quite freely. The most radical intervention obtained in the lists, where the rendering is at times barely adequate. His use of the A account varied; at times he practically lifted the text of the parallel account word for word as at 35₅—9 and 35₃₁, whereas more commonly he follows quite another route though his awareness of Exod A throughout seems clear.

D. Part 2 is comprised of 36₈—37₂₁. In the main it concerns itself with textiles, with metals brought in only where they are necessary to make the textile account reasonable; thus the various curtains do need pillars on which they are to be hung.

This contrasts with Part 3 where Beseleel's work with metals is central to the account. If the construction account in $\mathfrak{M}$, 36₈—39₃₁, be divided between Parts 2 and 3 of Exod and the materials described in one way or another in Part 3 be removed, the following matters in $\mathfrak{M}$ remain free for Part 2: 36₈—₃₄ the tabernacle itself; 36₃₅—₃₈ the veil and the tent door screen and their pillars; 37₂₅—₂₈ the incense altar; 38₉—₁₇ the court; 38₁₈—₁₉ screen for the court gate; 38₂₁—₂₃ concluding statement, and 39₁—₃₁ the priestly garments. Of these only the incense altar does not involve fabrics, and it was omitted not only in Part 3 where one might expect it but in Part 2 as well. On the other hand, 38₂₀ refers to the pins for tabernacle and court, but those for the court are mentioned in Part 2 as well.

Part 2 presents two large problems, neither of which admitting of more than speculative solutions. The first is the order of the items in Part 2. The large section on priestly garments from 39₁—₃₁ in $\mathfrak{M}$ is placed first. Only after that is done is the remainder of $\mathfrak{M}$ taken up in the order of $\mathfrak{M}$ itself, i.e. 36₈—₃₈ and 38₉—₂₃, which describe successively the making of the tabernacle, the veil and its four pillars, the screen of the tent door and its five pillars, the court, the screen of the court gate with its four pillars, the tentpins of the court, and a concluding statement.

This order was not that of the parent text. That a section has been “transferred” by Exod from a position before 39₃₂ of $\mathfrak{M}$ is clear from the evidence of Exod B. The equivalent of 39₃₂ is actually to be found in Part 3 at the end, at 39₁₁, just before the bridge statement of vv. 12 and 13. V. 13 may well betray the original position of the $\mathfrak{M}$ account of the making of the priestly garments. It states that of the fabrics which remain were made the service garments for Aaron; compare this statement with 39₁ of $\mathfrak{M}$. It should be noted that Part 4 then proceeds with the statement: “And they brought τὰς στολάς to Moses,” whereas $\mathfrak{M}$ has את המשכן, i.e. 39₁₄ in Exod has its counterpart in v. 33 of $\mathfrak{M}$.

But why then did he translate it first before the tabernacle and court accounts? Was it simply to get it over with, so as not to overlook it? Could it be as simple as that? After all, an obsession with the order of presentation of items is a modern problem; it did not trouble the ancients overly much as the rearrangement of materials first of all by **M** of the B account over against that of A itself tells us, and then also shown abundantly in the rearrangement of lists both in Exod A and in Exod B over against **M**.

The second problem to which I have no demonstrable solution is the shortening of the account of the building of the tabernacle. One would think that this was the most important item of all in the entire B narrative. In A it was certainly the most detailed and longest account of all, 261—30. So too in **M** of the B account the details of A are laboriously repeated in 368—34. But Exod deals with it in only two verses, 371—2, simply stating “And they made for the tent ten curtains. Twenty-eight cubits was the length of one curtain; the same (measurement) were they for all; and four cubits was the width of one curtain,” which equals one clause of 368 as well as v. 9 in **M**. In other words vv. 10—34 are simply omitted; so Exod omits the detailed description of the construction of the curtains of the tabernacle, of the קרשים pillars, as well as of the bars. This might be justified for vv. 20—34 which do not have anything to do with textiles, but vv. 10—19 describe both the ten inner curtains of dyed textiles and the eleven outer ones made of goats’ hair, the latter being completely overlooked in Exod B which refers only to the ten curtains. Did the translator really have a parent text with only two verses dealing with the tabernacle but with full statements on the court? Was there really ever a parent text which devoted more space to the veil within the tabernacle than to the tabernacle itself? Or did the translator feel that the details were already given in A, and why should he repeat them all over again? If the latter was the case his attitude towards his text is much more cavalierlike than that shown by A. Unfortunately there is no hard evidence to help us towards an answer, though an analysis of Part 3 shows that abbreviation of the parent text was indeed characteristic of Exod there as well.

In spite of these problems Part 2 is a translation document and not just a summary statement. What kind of translation it is can only be determined by comparing it with the text of **M**.

First then, the account of the priestly garments. The translator skillfully wove together what he found in **M** at 368 and at 391. The former began with ויעשו כל חכם לב ויעשו את בגדי הקדש אשר לאהרן כאשר צוה יהוה את משה בעשי המלאכה, whereas 391b reads ויעשו את בגדי הקדש אשר לאהרן כאשר צוה יהוה את משה. The former introduced the account of the making of the tabernacle, but Exod used it for his own purposes; he has a conflation and has καὶ ἐποίησεν πᾶς σοφὸς ἐν τοῖς ἐργαζομένοις τὰς στολὰς τῶν ἁγίων, αἳ εἰσιν Ἀαρὼν τῷ ἱερεῖ, καθὰ συνέταξεν κύριος τῷ Μωσῇ. In this way the object of the verb was changed to fit the garments rather than the tabernacle of **M** in 368.

The making of the ephod is somewhat more detailed in B than in A (286ff) and the translator does his work well. Sometimes he simplifies; in v. 10 (3 in **M**) instead of וירקעו and ויקצץ with reference to the gold leaf Exod simply has ἐτμήθη (τὰ πέταλα).

Or an interpretative idiom is used; thus the use of the gold thread (also v. 10) is shown as לעשות בתוך “for use among” (i.e. the various fabrics), and is translated by συνυφαναι σύν “to weave with.” Exod tries to make good sense out of difficult Hebrew and is not just satisfied with a word for word translation. Thus וחשב אפרתו אשר עליו in A (28^{8a}) is simply rendered by καὶ τὸ ὕφασμα τῶν ἐπωμίδων, ὃ ἐστὶν ἐπ’ αὐτῷ, a somewhat literal rendering, but in B (v. 11 b) this became ἔργον ὑφαντὸν εἰς ἄλληλα συμπεπλεγμένον καθ’ ἑαυτό “a woven work alternately intertwined by itself,” an obvious attempt to describe the weaving process. In v. 13 the method by which the stones (Exod B adds ἀμφοτέρους over against מ since there are two shoulder pieces involved, but cf the parallel in 28⁹ with its שתי – δύο) are prepared and attached to the shoulder pieces is related in detail. מ has מסבת משבצת זהב “surrounded by settings(?) of gold”; this Exod understands as “fastened together and embroidered about with gold (thread).” This is then described as מפתחת which is interpreted by means of a doublet construction γεγλυμμένους καὶ ἐκκολαμμένους “engraved and cut out (with the cuttings of a seal).”

The description of the construction of the oracle in מ is very similar in the A and B accounts (28^{15–28} and 39^{8–21} resp.), and in the first part of the descriptions in Exod (28^{15–21} and 36^{15–21}) the two accounts are obviously related, i.e. the translator of B probably consulted Exod A and practically took it over with only minor variants; cf A 12 above. Similarly in v. 22 χρῶσσοις συμπεπλεγμένους was taken over from A to render שרשרת גבלת. מ of 28^{24–28} had really not been translated at all, cf A 1a above, but in Exod B (36^{25–29}) we find a serious attempt at translating the section on the cords and rings by which the oracle was to be attached to the ephod in 39^{17–21}. Since מ is a difficult text with a number of obscurities Exod shows a certain degree of freedom. Thus the קצות of the oracle in v. 17 is rendered by τῶν μερῶν “the sides,” but in the following verse it becomes εἰς τὰς (δύο) συμβολάς “for the (two) junctures.” In the next verse מ defines the positioning of the golden rings on the corners of the oracle as “on its inside edge which is next to the ephod.” This Exod (v. 27) interprets as ἐπ’ ἄκρου τοῦ λογίου ἐπὶ τὸ ἄκρον τοῦ ὀπισθίου τῆς ἐπωμίδος ἔσωθεν “on the edge of the oracle at the edge of the back of the ephod on the inside.” The final verse describes how the oracle and the ephod were to be tied together; it is quite freely rendered, at times departing radically from מ as e.g. συμπεπλεγμένους εἰς “being woven into” for על להיות “so as to be on,” but the general sense of מ is nicely given by the Greek. In fact throughout this difficult account the Greek never makes an egregious error and is really a fine translation.

Vv. 30–34 deal with the blue robe of the ephod. It is a good translation of 39^{22–26} of מ, actually flowing somewhat more smoothly than מ does. As in the case of Exod A the writer did not know what to do with כפי תחרא and made a safe guess with διυφασμένον συμπλεκτόν, rather different from that of A: τὴν συμβολὴν συνυφασμένην. From the context (לא יקרע – ἀδιάλυτον) the translator knew that the garment including the neck with its hem had to be such that it would not break or tear, and accordingly used “interwoven, braided.”

The final verses of the chapter are a good translation of the Hebrew. As an exam-

ple of such translation one might note how פתוחי חותם is rendered here as opposed to elsewhere in the account. In v. 13 the phrase referred to the insertion of the stones into the shoulder pieces of the ephod; it becomes ἐκκόλαμμα σφραγίδος. Then in v. 21 (14 in *ℳ*) the phrase simply describes, by apposition, the four rows of stones with the names of the tribes as ἐγγεγλυμμένοι σφραγίδες. But in v. 39 (30 in *ℳ*) the phrase refers to the written letters on the crown plate as ἐκτετυπωμένα σφραγίδος. In each case the word chosen is peculiarly suited to the context.

There follow the two verses (37₁—2) devoted to the tabernacle construction (36₈—34 in *ℳ*), which were discussed above. The Exod account finds its source in the words עשר יריעת המשכן עשר from v. 8 plus all of v. 9, but omitted vv. 10—34, and then continues with 36₃₅—38 which deal with the veil and the screen of the tent door and their pillars. This account is not unreasonably translated, though in Exod A (cf A 5 above) the collocation ורים . . . אדנים (v. 36) “hooks . . . bases,” was rejected in favour of the more common αἱ κεφαλίδες . . . αἱ βάσεις; as a matter of fact when “bases” involved ורים, “capitals” is often substituted for ורים, as being a more fitting collocation. When one looks at the text two verses later (v. 6; 36₃₈ in *ℳ*), however, Exod has τὰς κεφαλίδας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ψαλίδας αὐτῶν κατεχρυσώσαν χρυσίῳ καὶ αἱ βάσεις αὐτῶν πέντε χαλκαῖ. Here τὰς κεφαλίδας αὐτῶν renders ראשיהם, and the rendering τὰς ψαλίδας αὐτῶν is for the difficult חשקיהם which has been taken from 27₁₀ 11. V. 5 shows how the translator was aware of his own work as a literary creation, since it was made as a conscious parallel to his own v. 3. Except for the veil being described as τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηנῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου it is an exact replica of v. 3 rather than a translation of *ℳ*. It might be noted, e.g. that Exod added χερουβίμ which has no basis whatsoever in *ℳ* but was copied from v. 3.

Vv. 7—14 (38₉—16 in *ℳ*) deal with the court and its pillars. The Greek compresses the text somewhat; for each of the four sides it only has “their pillars XX (number) and their bases XX (number),” omitting any mention of חשקיהם ועמודים ווי or of any metals involved. Curiously enough the hangings, קלעים, are referred to four times but are not consistently translated; the first and third ones are rendered by ἱστία, and the second and fourth ones, by αὐλαῖαι. There seems to be no other reason than that of variation for the alternation since they are more or less synonymous. The orientation of the court is the usual Palestinian one with the front facing east.

V. 15 also deals with the court’s pillars but it presented some difficulties to the translator. The phrase ווי העמודים וחשקיהם כסף is abbreviated to καὶ αἱ ἀγκύλαι αὐτῶν ἀργυραῖ, and instead of חם מחשקים כסף Exod has substituted οἱ στῦλοι περιηργυρωμένοι ἀργυρίῳ. It will be remembered that in vv. 8, 9, 10 (38₁₀—12 in *ℳ*) חשקיהם was consistently omitted. In our verse (= 38₁₇ in *ℳ*) it is clear that the word as well as the Pual participle of the root are both omitted. And two verses later חשקיהם is also omitted. In A (27₁₀ and cf 11) the word also occurs and it was translated by αἱ ψαλίδες; at v. 6 Exod B also uses it, presumably taken from the A account.

Vv. 16—17 deal with the screen of the court gate and its pillars, and except for the omission of חשקיהם are a literal rendering of *ℳ*. The final verses, vv. 19—21, are a conclusion to the tabernacle account, the work done under the direction of the two

architects, and also serve as a bridge to Part 3. Vv. 19—20 slightly compress the Hebrew (38^{21—22}) by omitting *המשכן* before *משכן* as tautologous, by limiting Beseleel to the immediate ancestry in his genealogy (i.e. omitting *בן חור*) and by coalescing *כל אשר* into *באשר*, (i.e. as *καθά*). In v. 23 more changes are made. By the omission of *אתו* Eliab is grammatically coordinated with Beseleel in the work. A doublet obtains for *ורקם*, i.e. *καὶ τὰ ῥαφιδεντὰ καὶ τὰ ποιμιλτά*, and the usual list of fabrics is shortened by leaving out “blue and purple.”

The text of Part 2 reads well. It is except for the puzzling omission of all but the introductory statement of the making of the curtains of the tabernacle from the account of its construction a good translation. When the translator meets a difficult passage he did what all good translators do; he consulted not only the context but the parallel account as well and then made sensible decisions. The section as a whole gives a reasonable picture of the items which were made.

E. Part 3 consists of two parts: ch. 38 details the construction work in metal on the part of Beseleel, whereas 39^{1—11} summarizes the amount of metals actually used in the construction. The first part reflects in the main the Hebrew text of 37^{1—24} and 38^{1—8}, and the summary of metal use is found in *ℳ* of 38^{24—32}.

1. Over against the Hebrew Exod often drastically abbreviates the construction account; in fact, in 38^{18—21} it is quite useless to search for a Hebrew source since he merely summarizes. The point of view which exercises the translator concerns the use of metals; in contrast to Part 2 where Eliab and those who were skilled *ἐποίησαν* all the things for the tent which consisted of textiles, here Beseleel alone is the one who made, cast, placed; in fact, in vv. 18—26 alone it is said ten times that *οὗτος* made, cast, silvered. This obsession with metal work is clear from the verbs used to show Beseleel's activity: made (17 times), gilded (4), cast (4), silvered (2), and placed (once). Similarly metals are mentioned 29 times: gold (18 times), silver (2), and bronze (9).

Successively, Exod briefly describes the construction of ark, propitiatory, table, staves for ark and table, the vessels for the table, the lampstand, the pillars, golden rings and hooks, tentpins, the bronze altar and its vessels and staves, anointing oil, incense compound, and the laver and its bases. All of these except for the oil and incense are metallic and involve either plating or casting, and the translator's method for abbreviating the Greek translation was to omit any materials and observations which did not concern metals. For example, vv. 1—4 represent Beseleel's making of the ark in *ℳ*'s 37^{1—5}. Only the bare essentials are given in Exod, its gilding, the golden molding, the four golden rings so placed that the staves could be inserted for transporting the ark. Omitted are all references in the Hebrew to the wood frame of the ark or to its dimensions; even the making of the staves, though gold-plated, is omitted. Exod does not contradict *ℳ* or anything in the A account; it is simply a statement stripped of all nonessential items.

The descriptions of the making of the propitiatory (vv. 5—8) and of the table

(vv. 9—12) follow the same pattern as that for the ark. For the former it is said that it and its two cherubs were made of (pure) gold, one cherub on either edge, they (together) overshadowing the propitiatory with their wings. Everything else in $\mathfrak{M}$ (or in the A account) is disregarded as not relevant to the main theme: Beseleel's work with metals. Exod even adds a detail not present in the Hebrew by defining the propitiatory as *ἀνωθεν τῆς κιβωτοῦ*. This detail does accord with 25^{20—21}, and to Exod this was an important detail; the two cherubs with wings spread out over the propitiatory define the place from which God spoke; see 25²¹.

Similarly, the account of the table's construction is severely curtailed; it is limited to those elements involving gold, viz. the table, its four rings, the staves of both ark and table, and its vessels. Even the Hebrew reference to the moldings of gold is omitted, probably on the understanding that these are already part of the table.

As in the case of the propitiatory one detail is added over against the Hebrew; the table is called *τὴν προκειμένην*. This participle also occurs in 39¹⁸ to describe *τοὺς ἄρτους*, "the bread which is set before." Exod may well have been influenced by the *הפנים שלחן* of Num 4⁷ "the table of the presence." The term is probably zeugmatic for "the table on which is placed the bread of the presence." The designation *τὴν προκειμένην*, which Num also adopted, can then be understood as "the table on which is put that which is set before the presence (of God);" see also 25²⁹.

The next item made is the lampstand. It thus follows the order of the Hebrew, so that in general a Hebrew basis for Part 3 is clear. Outside of vv. 18—21 which will be dealt with below, the order follows that of $\mathfrak{M}$'s 37^{1—38} except that the oil and incense come after rather than before the altar and its parts, and as in Parts 1 and 2 reference to the incense altar (37^{25—28} in $\mathfrak{M}$) is completely omitted. In spite of this the account in vv. 13—17 of the construction of the lampstand can only with imagination be called a translation of $\mathfrak{M}$, nor does it follow the A account; in fact, the two Hebrew accounts are almost word for word the same. Not that Exod contradicts those other accounts, though it does seem apparent that there is an avoidance of terms used in Exod A. Thus *πλαγίων* in A becomes *ἀμφοτέρων τῶν μερῶν αὐτῆς* here; for *σφαιρωτήρ καὶ κρίνον* B has *οἱ βλαστοί*; for *κρατῆρες* our text has *τὰ λαμπάδια αὐτῶν*, and *τὸν ἐπαρυστήρα . . . τὰ ὑποθέματα* in A (as renderings for the terms *מלקחיה* and *מחתתיה*) become *τὰς λαβίδας . . . τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας* in Exod B.

In v. 13 Exod characterizes the lampstand as *ἡ φωτίζει* which is not present in $\mathfrak{M}$. The notion that the lampstand is a cultic object which gives light highlights by a plus, as in the case of *ἀνωθεν τῆς κιβωτοῦ* in v. 5 for the propitiatory and of *τὴν προκειμένην* for the table in v. 9, the cultic function of the object made. Again this amplification can be paralleled elsewhere; comp. 25³⁷ 27^{20—21} and especially the *מנרת המאור* of Num 4⁹ as *τὴν λυχνίαν τὴν φωτίζουσιν* in LXX.

$\mathfrak{M}$ has the lampstand made of pure gold. Exod omits "pure" but characterizes it as *στερεάν* "solid" (the versification which puts this word in v. 14 is quite misleading; it is feminine and cannot modify *τὸν κανλόν*). This renders *מקשה* in its etymological sense, an interpretation also found in Num 8⁴, rather than as a technical term as in A, *τορευτήν*, in 25³⁰.

V. 15 interrupts the list of the parts of the lampstand of vv. 14, 16—17, and is almost laconic in its conciseness. It describes the branches of the lampstand as having buds (*βλαστοί*) projecting, three on either side, corresponding to each other. From the A account it becomes clear what this means. In 25₃₀ it is clear that the branches had *κρατήρες*, *σφαιρωτήρες* and *κρίνα*; the first of these is really the *τὰ λαμπάδια* of v. 16, and the other two are referred to by the cover term *βλαστοί* (for the פרחיה of *ℳ*; see 37₁₇) used to indicate the overall ornamentation of the lampstand. But *τρεις* can hardly modify *βλαστοί*, but rather the *καλαμίσκους* of v. 14; this is perfectly clear in the Hebrew as well as in the A account. The final modifier, *ἐξισούμενοι ἀλλήλοις*, also makes this clear; there are two sets of three branches on opposite sides of the shaft which are “mirror images of each other.” The attempt at brevity and conciseness has not produced a model of clarity.

V. 16 is also quite different from the Hebrew (vv. 19—22). In its description each branch (i. e. six) as well as the central shaft had a *λαμπάδιον*, a small cuplike affair for the oil, and an *ἐνθέμιον*, a holder for the actual light, both described as being *ἐξ αὐτῶν*, the antecedent of which is *ἄκρων*; what is meant is that it was of one piece with the ends of the branches. These *λαμπάδια* were described as being *καρυωτά*, i. e. almondlike in their formation. The verse ends with *στερεὸν ὅλον χρυσοῦν*, which applies only to the seventh *ἐνθέμιον* at the top of the central shaft of the lampstand. The phrase presumably reflects the Hebrew of 37_{22b}: כלה מקשה אחת זהב זהב מזהב, though the כלה there must refer to מנרה.

V. 17 shows the preoccupation which Exod had with metals. The three nominals listed are (*ἐπὶ τὰ*) *λύχνους ἐπ' αὐτῆς*, *τὰς λαβίδας αὐτῆς* and *τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας αὐτῆς*. In *ℳ* the list ends with the metal, זהב מזהב, but Exod repeats “gold” for each one individually. The first nominal in *ℳ* is נרתיה; instead of a simple *αυτης* Exod has a prepositional phrase *ἐπ' αὐτῆς* which is reminiscent of נרתיה עליה of Zach 4₂ which may have been in the translator's mind. Whether the Zach passage or the short Hebrew accounts of Num 4₉ 8₄ influenced Exod's account is not clear; their translators did seem to be familiar with Exod B rather than with Exod A.

Vv. 18—27 are unique in the book with ten occurrences of *οὔτος* all referring to Beseleel as subject. The section is a summary list of other objects involved with metal for which *οὔτος* was also responsible. Exod B's passion for metal work is particularly clear here; in these ten verses there are six cases of verbs dealing with casting or metal plating, five of gold, two of silver and nine of bronze, a total of 22 references in ten verses.

But it is vv. 18—21 that create the greatest difficulties since these have no particular Hebrew parent text. Since Part 2 had dispensed with the making of the tabernacle in two verses, viz. 37₁—2, an account occupying 31 verses in *ℳ*, 36₈—₃₈, it contained no reference to metal work involved in pillars, clasps, rings, etc. and Exod apparently here seems to make an attempt at summarizing the more essential uses to which precious metals had been put, but in the attempt at brevity the use of metals for tabernacle and court are not rigidly kept apart resulting in real confusion. Furthermore the translator also uses a vocabulary intentionally different from that of A,

and one is not always certain as to which detail of the Hebrew account, whether of A or B, he actually is referring to.

The difficulties begin with the first clause in v. 18: “he (οὗτος) silverplated the pillars.” But the verse is referring to the tabernacle, and its קרש pillars were goldplated (26²⁹ 36³⁴). The statement is contradictory. At the end of v. 20 he also says “he silverplated them (i. e. the pillars)” but there the reference seems to be to the עמוד pillars of the courtyard which were indeed silverplated according to 27¹⁷ 37¹⁵.

The verse continues with “and cast for the pillars gold rings, and gilded the bars with gold” which reflects M’s 36³⁴, (cf also 26²⁹), and proves that the first clause must have intended the tabernacle pillars and not those of the court. The final units state: “and gilded the pillars of the veil with gold, and made the hooks golden;” these reflect M of 36³⁶. The use of ἀγκύλας to render וויהם shows that the translator was fully aware of what ווים were in spite of his use in Part 2 of κεφαλίδες at 37⁴; cf section D above.

V. 19 lists three cases of κρίκους which οὗτος ἐποίησεν: the clasps of the tent of gold, the clasps of the court, the clasps εἰς τὸ ἐκτείνειν τὸ κατακάλυμμα ἄνωθεν of brass. The first of these reflects the Hebrew of 36¹³ and the last one, 36¹⁸. As to the middle one, no metal is mentioned though according to M’s 38¹⁰ the hooks of the עמוד pillars were silver (cf also A’s 27¹⁰). Why the translator failed to render כסף here is totally obscure.

V. 20 begins with: “he cast the silver κεφαλίδας of the tent, and the bronze κεφαλίδας of the doors of the tent and of the gate of the court.” But with respect to the doors of the tent 26³⁷ says “their κεφαλίδες were gold and . . . the five βάσεις bronze,” and at 27¹⁷ for the pillars of the court (which included those of the gate) Exod states “their κεφαλίδες were gold and their βάσεις were bronze.” Furthermore for the pillars of the tent 26¹⁹ 21 25 state that each pillar was to have two βάσεις – אדנים of silver. It will be recalled that in A 4 the discussion of קרשים showed that Exod viewed the אדנים as being on the two ends of the pillar, and so whether one called an end top or bottom made no difference. So too Exod B uses the term κεφαλίδες as equal to βάσεις. That this was his clear intention is obvious from 39^{4–5} where he uses κεφαλίδας to render אדנים. In fact in 39⁶ he uses the same word to render ראשיהם. It is then clear that he uses the word to mean “extremities.” But this is then extended to the pillars of the tent door and of the gate of the court as well. For both of these it is actually said that they had bronze אדנים (36³⁸ and 38¹⁹ resp.), but in each case the אדנים contrast with “capitals”; for the tent door the capitals were of gold, and for the gate of the court, of silver. That the translator used κεφαλίδες to render אדנים is obvious, but one could wish that he had not been quite so clever about it and had used βάσεις throughout, but except for 39^{8–9} the term βάσεις as applied to pillars is not used at all in Part 3.

V. 21 presents no real problem. That the tentpins for both tent and courtyard were bronze is clear from the Hebrew of 38²⁰ as well as 27¹⁹. It seems obvious that the translator had a Hebrew text in mind since both Exod A and B (27¹⁹ 37¹⁸) limit the term “bronze” to the courtyard tentpins.

Vv. 22—24 deal with the building of the altar, its vessels and other accoutrements, reflecting the Hebrew 381—7. Again the description is much abbreviated, so that of vv. 1—2 only “he made the bronze altar” is retained, all other details being omitted; on the other hand, a midrash giving the source of the bronze is added: “from the bronze censers which belonged to the men who rebelled with the assembly of Kore,” a reference to Num 16^{37—39}; compare this with *מחתות הנחשת* of Num 17⁴.

V. 23 lists “all the vessels of the altar” as made of bronze, but the list does not correspond fully to that of *מ*. Instead of five Exod has only four, the first of which, *תֵּיבַת בָּאֵשׁ*, hardly being a vessel, though “base of the altar” is a well-known term; cf 29¹². Instead of this *מ* has *אֵת הַסִּירָה וְאֵת הַיָּעִים* which are omitted in Exod. The remaining three do occur in both, though not in the same order. *מ* has: “bowls, forks, fire-pans” for which Exod has: fire-pan, bowls, forks, i.e. the order is 3 1 2.

V. 24 is an abbreviated version of *מ*'s 38^{4—7} in which v. 6, the construction of the staves, is entirely omitted, and v. 7 is barely represented by *εὐρεῖς τοῖς μοχλοῖς ὥστε αἶρειν τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐν αὐτοῖς*. Particularly odd is the substitution of *μοχλοῖς* for the usual *διωστήρσιν* (vv. 4, 10), since *μοχλός* is the common rendering for *בַּרִּיחַ*, not for *בַּר* (though the singular *בַּרִּיחַ* is not unlike *בָּדִים* palaeographically). Admittedly “bars” were also long and thin but they were never used to carry tabernacle objects; rather “staves, poles” were used for that purpose. The A account has *φορεῖς*.

Exod B's conception of the altar's construction is somewhat different from that of Exod A. In the latter both the *מַכְבֵּר* and the *כִּרְכַּב* were translated by *ἔσχαραν*. The latter term is rendered by *πυρεῖον* here, i.e. “a fire-pan, fire hearth,” with the result that the translator could hardly use *ἔσχαραν* for *מַכְבֵּר*, so he chose a more neutral term, *παράθεμα* “something put alongside, an appendage,” here further defined as an *ἔργον δικτυωτόν* “a lattice work.” This netlike appendage was then put under *αὐτοῦ τοῦ πυρεῖου*; in other words it was the underpart of the fire hearth, the grating. Its position is then further defined as being *ὑπὸ αὐτὸ* (i.e. of the *πυρεῖου*) *ἕως τοῦ ἡμίσεος αὐτοῦ* (which must have *θυσιαστήριον* as antecedent, cf 27⁵). The translator presents a compact but clearly reconstructable description of the altar; actually he even smoothes out a difficulty in *מ* by substituting *καὶ ἐπέθημεν* + dative for *ב + וַיִּצַק*, i.e. he placed four bronze rings at the four sides of the altar's *παράθεμα*.

In *מ* the making of the anointing oil and the incense compound was detailed between the account of the building of the incense altar, 37^{25—28}, and that of the (bronze) altar of the burnt offering, 38^{1—7}. Since Exod B omitted the former entirely, that account, 37²⁹, could best come after that of the bronze altar. Admittedly, no metal work was involved, but it was part of Beseleel's work; furthermore oil and incense were important for the cult in which Exod B was vitally interested, and their position between altar and laver (vv. 26—27) was more sensible than between tentpins and altar. The Greek is not a bad rendering of *מ*, except that it has changed the syntax of *קֹדֶשׁ* and *מַהוּר* which are nominals modifying the verb *יָעַשׂ*. Exod made the first one adjectival modifying *ἔλαιον*, and the second one an adjective modifying *ἔργον*, i.e. “a pure work (of a perfumer).”

Vv. 26—27 deal with the laver and its base and are an amalgam based on $\mathfrak{M}$ of 38^s and 40^{30—32}. V. 26 renders the former passage, only the latter part of which creating difficulty for the translator. According to the Hebrew the bronze laver and base were made “from the mirrors of מועד אהל פתח אשר צבאו פתח אהל מועד.” The cognate participle and verb also occur in connection with “the tent of meeting” in Num 4²³ and 8²⁴ where reference is made to adult male Levites who are to “come לעבד בעבדת of the tent of meeting” (4²³ has לעבד העבדה ב instead of בעבדת). The צבא notion is defined then as “performing cultic duties in the tent of testimony.” But for women to perform cultic duties even though only at the door of the tabernacle was unheard of, and furthermore the tabernacle was not yet erected, so Exod rather ingeniously rendered the offending collocation by τῶν νηστευσασσῶν αἱ ἐνήστευσαν “the women who were fasting,” a cultic practice which women as well as men could perform. And then Exod added “at the time that he (i.e. Beseleel) set it up (i.e. the tent).” The women were thus merely fasting near the door at the time of the erection of the tabernacle.

With v. 27 Exod B has transferred the account of the placement and use of the laver from 40^{30—32} so as to be part of the construction account rather than as part of the setting up of the tabernacle complex. They are accordingly omitted entirely in Part 4.

In order to fit in the new context he substituted for 40³⁰'s statement of the placement of the laver and its being filled with water a repeated (from v. 26) “and he made the laver,” and then took ורחצו purposively as ἵνα νίπωνται. Beyond that vv. 31 and 32 are well rendered except for two explanatory expansions on v. 32; בקרבם בל המזבח is rendered literally but with a purposive infinitive λειτουργεῖν added at the end, and ירחצו is rendered by ἐνίπτοντο plus ἐξ αὐτοῦ.

Since the account in ch. 38 is so terse and at times only vaguely represents its Hebrew counterpart, in fact is in part only a summary statement, it has been the despair of scholars who usually simply disregard it, or abandon any attempt at finding a basis in the Hebrew.¹⁰⁾

That the relation between Exod and the Hebrew at times seems quite tenuous can be convincingly demonstrated by a reconstruction of Origen's Hexapla. As is well-known Origen's approach to his LXX text was quantitative. If the Greek had some text not present in his Hebrew he placed it under the obelus. If on the other hand the Hebrew text was longer, he would borrow its equivalent from some other sources.¹¹⁾

¹⁰⁾ Thus Gooding (see especially chh. V and VI) considers the account as having no basis in the Hebrew, but believes that it is a later amalgam made by an editor who rather incompetently excerpted the A account without adequate regard for context; in other words the difficulties met in ch. 38 are due to an incompetent later editor. As the above analysis hopefully shows such a radical conclusion is overly critical of the translator.

¹¹⁾ For an analysis of this problem see the thorough study of D. Fraenkel, “Die Quellen der asterisierten Zusätze im zweiten Tabernakelbericht Exod 35—40,” MSU XX, 140—186.

2. The second section of Part 3, 391—11, presents relatively few problems. It should occasion no surprise that Exod in view of his arrangement of materials should assign the statement on the amount of metals used for the various accoutrements of tent and court from 38^{24—31} in *ℳ* to follow the summary statement of Beseleel's work with metals which dominated ch. 38. The section deals successively with gold (v. 1), silver (vv. 2—6) and bronze (vv. 7—10) with v. 11 as a concluding statement appropriately concluding that "the Israelites had done as the Lord had ordered Moses — so they did."

The use of the gold is only defined in general terms as that "which was worked up for the *ἔργα* according to all the *ἐργασίαν* of the holy things;" the translator thus distinguished between the cognates מלאכת and מלאכה by using cognate nouns as well. The gold brought is appropriately called ἀπαρχῆς, here used uniquely for the less appropriate תנופה of *ℳ*; it more commonly renders תרומה as at 25² and in B at 35⁵ 36⁶. But ἀπαρχῆς in 35⁵ is defined as οἷσουσιν . . . χρυσίον, ἀργύριον, χαλκόν, etc.

The silver offering is called an ἀφαίρεμα (*ℳ* only has כסף). The source of the silver is defined more precisely than in 35⁵ as being the poll tax ordered in 30^{13—14}. According to that assessment every adult male had to give "half a drachm as an εἰσφορά to the Lord." According to the census report in Num 1³², here repeated, there were 603, 550 such males. This source is defined as παρὰ τῶν ἐπεσκευμένων ἀνδρῶν of the congregation, whereas the Hebrew simply has פקודי העדה. Exod thus excludes the substantial female contributors (35²²); this silver had as its specific source, the total number of half drachms collected by the poll tax. The amount is thus 100 talents (3000 shekels = one talent) and 1775 shekels.

The use to which this silver was put is divided into two. The hundred talents were used for casting the κεφαλίδας both of the tent and of the veil (vv. 4—5). Here it is fully clear that κεφαλίδας renders אדני, since Exod is obviously translating 38²⁷ of *ℳ*, where the bound form אדני occurs both before הקדש as well as before הפרכת. Exod renders הקדש by τῆς σκηνῆς quite by design, since only the pillars of the tent, not of the entire complex of tent and court are intended. That there were 100 capitals is also justified from the A account in ch. 26. The two long sides had 20 pillars per side, with two bases/capitals per pillar making 80, plus eight pillars of the same קרש type on the west side making another 16; for the veil there were four pillars but these had distinctive bases and capitals, thus four more, making a total of 100 capitals.

The second matter for which the silver was used is stated in v. 6: "they made the 1775 shekels into the hooks of the pillars." The rest of the verse, however, presents a problem since *ℳ* now uses the term ראשיהם, "their capitals;" in other words, the Hebrew now differentiates between capital and base for the sanctuary, a distinction which Exod had consistently denied. So *ℳ* has pillars with bases cast of silver and capitals plated; Exod which understood צפה to mean goldplated, has pillars with capitals (on both ends) cast in silver and then goldplated. Furthermore he (Beseleel) ornamented them, which is what κατεκόσμησεν presumably means (cf Isa 61¹⁰ MacI 45⁷); this renders the Piel of חשק which is a hapax legomenon in *ℳ*, though cf the Pual participle at 27¹⁷ 38¹⁷ in the context of silver for the courtyard pillars.

Vv. 7—10 deal with the bronze used; it is called a תְּנוּפָה (as in v. 1) but rendered by ἀφαιρέματος (also used of the silver in v. 3). The amount used as in the case of the other metals is an accurate rendering of the Hebrew amounts, but the items listed as using bronze are differently ordered. All the pillars involved (the door of the tent, the court, and the gate of the court) are עַמּוּדִים so that bases and capitals would contrast; accordingly the translator here uses βάσεις throughout and not κεφαλίδας. That these were made of bronze is attested in A at 26³⁷ and 27^{10—18}. These are listed serially along with the tentpins of both the tent and court (27¹⁹), all of bronze. Only after that in v. 10 are the accoutrements of the altar dealt with, whereas in M these stand in second place, immediately after the tent door. Exod does not mention the bronze altar separately since at 38²² the source for its bronze is listed as being different, the bronze censers of the Korahite rebels.

V. 10 then ends with “and all τὰ ἐργαλεῖα of the tent of witness” followed by v. 11 which formulaically ends the section. Since up to this point ch. 38 in M had come to an end, Exod had to skip 39^{1—31}, the account of the making of the priestly garments, with which Part 2 had started, and proceed to 39³². This started with ותכל “and there was finished” which of course had to be omitted, but the rest of v. 32 a is rendered at the end of v. 10, and the second half of the verse is then translated in v. 11.

All in all with few exceptions Part 3 is a reasonable account of Beseleel’s work, reasonable if one is willing to look at it from the translator’s point of view. It does at times differ from M, at times radically, but if one grant Exod the singleminded interest in metal work it makes a sensible narration. Even most of the apparent contradictions with other parts of Exod B disappear, and only a few real incongruities remain.

3. Vv. 12 and 13 constitute a bridge between Parts 3 and 4. The use of the formulaic “as the Lord commanded Moses” to conclude Part 3 already ties it with Part 4; see vv. 22, 23 and 40^{14, 17, 19, 21, 23, 24}, whereas the ending οὕτως (ἐποίησεν) ties it to Part 3 with its tenfold οὕτως plus aorist verb in ch. 38.

These two verses, however, are not part of Part 3 as the δέ structure with which v. 12 begins shows, and since the verses refer to the rest of the gold and the leftover textiles which Parts 2 and 3 had been dealing with, are also not part of Part 4. But they are verses written to bridge the construction accounts and the delivery and assemblage of materials account.

The terms λοιπόν and the καταλειφθεῖσαν textiles show that we are dealing not with a transition from vv. 1—11 to vv. 14 ff., but from Parts 3 and 2 resp. to Part 4. V. 12 cannot refer to vv. 1—11, since nothing is there said about any items made of gold (in contrast to silver and bronze). So the reference must apply to Beseleel’s work, more specifically to 38^{1—19}. Similarly the reference in v. 13 to the leftover textiles being used for στολὰς λειτουργικάς contradicts Exod B’s own ordering of materials, since Part 2 begins with the lengthy account about Aaron’s robes, after which tent and courtyard are described. In fact, the leftover textiles for στολὰς fits best as a reference to 37^{1—18}. The two verses then parallel each other in referring to the end of the construction accounts of metal work and of textiles.

Not fully clear is what is meant by *σκεύη* which were made of the remaining gold. Gold is the one material which is common to both the textile and the metal work accounts and what may well have been intended was a cover term for all items not specifically mentioned in the shortened description of metal work in ch. 38. What again betrays the B translator is the motif of cultic service which these bridge verses make dominant. The *σκεύη* are to be “for performing cultic service — *τὸ λειτουργεῖν* — with them before the Lord.” And in v. 14 the garments are described as “*λειτουργικάς* garments for Aaron,” made “*ὥστε λειτουργεῖν* with them in the sanctuary.” The *λειτουργεῖν* theme is what to Exod B this is all about.

F. Part 4 is the conclusion of the tabernacle account and consists of two parts: in 39^{14–23} the constructed items are brought to Moses and having examined and approved them he blesses the people, and in ch. 40 the tabernacle is erected and the furniture is all placed ready for the entrance of the divine glory after which the tabernacle occupies its central and determinative place in the life of the desert community.

The delivery list in 39^{14–23} shows considerable differences over against that of *ℳ*. It is shorter in that all sub-items such as bars, staves, pillars, etc. are omitted. *ℳ*’s list exclusive of these sub-items consists of the following: 1. tent; 2. curtains; 3. ark; 4. table; 5. lampstand; 6. the altar of gold; 7. anointing oil; 8. incense compound; 9. covering for tent door; 10. altar of bronze; 11. laver; 12. hangings for the court; 13. covering for court gate; 14. all the vessels for use in the tent; 15. (woven garments for service in the sanctuary) holy garments for Aaron and his sons. Over against this Exod has: 1. robes; 2. tent; 3. ark; 4. altar; 5. anointing oil; 6. incense compound; 7. lampstand; 8. table; 9. robes for Aaron and his sons; 10. hangings for the court; 11. covering for the tent door; 12. covering for court gate; 13. all the vessels and utensils of the tent; 14. curtains; 15. tentpins; 16. all the utensils for use in the tent.

So in Exod nos. 6 and 11 are omitted from *ℳ*’s list, and the list is expanded by nos. 1, 13 and 15; no. 13 is a doublet of no. 16, and no. 15 is presented as a separate item but occurs in *ℳ* as a sub-item for nos. 12 and 13.

The order is also considerably different. In fact, *ℳ*’s items are rearranged as follows (with X for extra items): X 1 3 10 7 8 5 4 15 12 9 13 X 2 X 14. Exod has downgraded both the golden altar and the laver with the former only mentioned in 40^{5 24} and the laver entirely removed from Part 4 to Part 3 for mention at 38^{26–27}. As for the rest the rearrangement follows a definite plan. If one take nos. 1 and 2 as introductory cover items the remainder, except for the unexpected separate mention of tentpins, is arranged according to the divisions already met in Parts 2 and 3. Thus the oil and incense were mentioned as part of Beseleel’s work, and nos. 3–8 are all items mentioned in ch. 38, whereas nos. 9–15 involving textiles were mentioned in Part 2.

In summary, it appears that the following items from *ℳ* are not present in Exod: the propitiatory, the hooks and קרשים of the tent, the cords for the court, the garments woven for service in the tent, the incense altar, the bronze grating and poles of the bronze altar, the laver and its base.

In the second section, ch. 40, the phrase **מִשְׁכַּן אֹהֶל מוֹעֵד** occurs in vv. 2, 6 and 29; this created a problem since Exod translates **מִשְׁכַּן** as well as **אֹהֶל** by *σκηνή*. Exod meets the problem by using a single “(the) tent,” i.e. in vv. 2 and 6, as “tent of testimony” and in v. 29, simply as “the tent.” Furthermore in v. 5 **לְמִשְׁכַּן** is rendered by *τῆς σκηνῆς τοῦ μαρτυρίου*, and in v. 17 where the Hebrew (v. 19) says: “and he spread the **אֹהֶל** over the **מִשְׁכַּן**,” Exod has *καὶ ἐξέτεινεν τὰς αὐλαίας ἐπὶ τὴν σκηνήν*. Of course, the **אֹהֶל** consisted of curtains, though in Exod A these are called *δέσρεις* with the term *αὐλαῖαι* being reserved for the **מִשְׁכַּן** curtains.

V. 7 referred to the laver and is therefore entirely omitted. Nor is v. 8 rendered unless the gloss in v. 6b, for which see Section E above, be taken as a vague allusion to the court; in any event v. 8b of **מ** is certainly omitted.

Vv. 9—14 are accurately rendered by Exod except for v. 11 which deals with the consecration of the laver and its base, which is omitted. In v. 15 (v. 17 in **מ**) the term “second year” is not further defined in the Hebrew, but is fully identified in Exod by a gloss *ἐκπορευομένων αὐτῶν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου*. In the next verse **אֲדָנִי** becomes *τὰς κεφαλίδας* for which see Section E above. The reference is to the **מִשְׁכַּן** which in Exod A had no “capitals” at all, but rather two bases, with one on either end. From the same verse Exod predictably omitted **וַיִּשֶׁם אֶת קְרָשָׁיו**. V. 18 only renders v. 20a of **מ**, while v. 20b with its reference to the placement of the propitiatory is omitted. It might also be noted that in the next verse *τὸ κατακάλυμμα τοῦ καταπετάσματος* is used to translate **אֶת פֶּרֶכֶת הַמִּסָּךְ** thereby showing that for Exod B as for A the two nouns are synonyms.

Differences between Exod and **מ** in the rest of the chapter consist in the main of a shorter text for Exod. In v. 22 Exod omits **נָכַח הַשְּׁלַחַן** for the placement of the lampstand. All of v. 28, the positioning of the screen of the tent door, is omitted. So too vv. 29b—32 have no place in Exod; these refer to the sacrifices performed on the altar, and to the laver’s position and use, all these as Yahweh had ordered Moses. And finally v. 33b **וַיִּתֵּן אֶת מִסַּךְ שַׁעַר הַחֹצֵר** also has no counterpart in Exod.

In summary, it can be said that Exod abbreviates the text considerably and it is not always clear why he does so. Nor does he share entirely the picture of the sanctuary as Exod A has it. It is not only much briefer, but the order of events also differs. Omissions in ch. 40 involve the screen for the court gate (twice), the propitiatory, the **קְרָשִׁים** of the tent, as well as all references to the laver. When these are compared to the list in ch. 39, they only partially reflect those, though some kind of rationale seems to underlie both.

As to the parent text for Part 4 little can be said. Since Exod abbreviates as a matter of course, it says nothing about the longer text of **מ**. Where the two differ, Exod does not usually seem to be an improvement, and there is no good reason to suggest a different Hebrew text underlying the text of Exod in general.

1. From the brief analysis given above it is clear that Exod B faced a double problem, viz. that of a Hebrew parent text on the one hand, and that of an Exod A account on the other. A literal translation of the Hebrew B account would be quite unsuitable since such a rendering would not fit as an adequate conclusion to Exod A; furthermore the B account in $\mathfrak{M}$ had itself already reordered materials over against its pattern account. Nor would it have been adequate to abandon the B account of $\mathfrak{M}$ entirely in favor of a newly rewritten Exod A in the past tense as its completion statement, even though the translator's awareness of a certain tension between the two accounts was heightened by the recurring formula *כִּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יְהוָה*, which forced him to constant reference to the A account. What was needed was a translation document of a different sort, one which did indeed recount the carrying out of the orders given in A, not as an independent statement but rather as one that would fit the A account as a counterpart, resulting in a tabernacle statement in which B was a constituent part and the whole a single but complete account. Accordingly, he felt the need to abbreviate the construction account substantially. When details such as the coverings for the tent door or those for the gate of the court could easily be understood as included in the overall concept of tent or court, they were omitted. Or if an account could be severely curtailed about some single core notion which may not have been overly central in the pattern account, it was done, as e.g. in ch. 38 where the use of metals was the overriding principle according to which the translator chose details for inclusion in his translation.

Admittedly, almost complete disregard for certain sections of $\mathfrak{M}$ is more difficult to comprehend. Why did Exod B omit entirely the details of the construction of the tabernacle except for the two verses at the beginning of ch. 37 (though one should not overlook the possible allusions to the omitted materials in 38¹⁸⁻²¹ noted in Section D above)? And why did he omit quite intentionally all reference to the golden altar of incense but then record its placement nonetheless in 40^{5,24}, and conversely, why did he record in 38^{26,27} the construction of the laver and its base but fail to note any reference whatsoever to its placement in ch. 40? Attempts to understand these omissions in the past have been speculative and I have no solution to offer either, but I would enter a caveat: a solution must be sought in an analysis of what Exod B understood his task to be and of his overall plan over against the A account. One must insist that Exod B did not believe his task to be one of simply translating the $\mathfrak{M}$ text of chh. 35—40, but rather in some way of presenting an account which, while not contradicting the Hebrew text, would show how Moses carried out the orders given in the pattern account.

On the other hand, Exod B is not simply a replica of the A account restated in the aorist tense. There is clearly an attempt made to be different from A. After all, the translator was faced with a Hebrew text which largely repeated substantial parts of the A account as now being carried out. But this could have been summarily stated simply by *οὕτως ἐποίησεν Μωϋσῆς*, instead of laboriously restating the pattern ac-

count in detail in past tense. What has evolved from the above study is that this work is a well-planned, well-constructed account which when read by itself and without prejudice usually makes good sense.

Now there are matters of terminology in which he distances himself from A. He avoids certain terms which A prefers. E. g. except for one instance, 35¹¹, he does not use *ἀναφορεῖς* to translate בָּדִים, a word he knew perfectly well from A, but uses *διωστήρες*, equally adequate but different. And then there is the intentional use of *κεφαλίδες* instead of *βάσεις* to describe the אֲדָנִי קְרָשִׁים of the tent. Admittedly, the two identical ends could be called “capitals” as well as “bases,” but over against *℣* it was certainly unusual even if defensible. And then there are the unusual words which occur only here in the entire LXX: *εὐρύς* (3), *παράθεμα* (2), *ἐνθέμιον* (2), *κάτοπτρον* and *καταστασιάζω*. Exod B also uses some terms not found in Exod A such as *ἐπαρυστρίς*, *κατακοσμέω*, *λαβίς*, *λαμπάδια* (2) and *στερεός* (2).

More important than lexical items, however, are matters of individual style. One such is the way in which the articulated adjectival phrase is rendered. In Greek two patterns are equally normal; either “article + noun + article + adjectival modifier” or “article + adjectival modifier + noun” can occur. In Exod A the former with few exceptions is the pattern found. It should be said that excluded from consideration are all instances in which the modifier is a cardinal or ordinal number, for which both patterns recur throughout Exod. One exception is the idiom “the Red Sea” which throughout the LXX except for two (or three) instances is always of the “article + adjective + noun” pattern. The exceptions are Deut 114 and Ios 246. It occurs twice in Cod B in the latter verse, but the first instance of *της ερυθρας* is probably secondary. All other references in LXX (10 instances) represent the “article + adjective + noun” pattern. This also occurs in Exod 1—34 (10¹⁹ 13¹⁸ 23³¹). The only other instance of the pattern in Exod A is 26²⁸ *τὸ ἕτερον κλίτος*. In Exod B this pattern occurs four times: 36¹ *τὰ ἅγια καθήκοντα*; 39² *τῶν ἐπεσκευμένων ἀνδρῶν*; 39¹² *τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν χρυσίον*, and 39¹³ *τὴν καταλειφθεῖσαν ὑάκινθον*.

Furthermore, the patterning of compound numbers is also different in Exod B. The pattern in Exod is that of descending grades, i. e. myriads, thousands, hundreds, tens and single units. In ch. 6 these are unconnected with *καί* but in ch. 39 they are all thus connected except for the final tens and single units.

And finally, the unique insistence on the part of the writer that the subject throughout ch. 38 is to be identified as Beseleel through the use of *οὗτος* in preverbal position is repeatedly used. It occurs ten times in 38^{18—26} and does not occur elsewhere throughout Exod; in fact, *οὗτος* occurs only here in the book.

2. Two questions still remain to be dealt with briefly.

a) What kind of parent text lay behind Exod B? Was the parent Hebrew much like *℣* or was it substantially different?

The answer to this cannot, of course, be an absolute one, and it must also be methodologically conditioned by the principle that different parent texts should only

be postulated if reasonable attempts to understand Exod on the basis of a text more or less like $\mathfrak{M}$ have been made.

The difference in order for Part 2 need not be textually determined; in fact, there are numerous indications that it was Exod who was responsible for the reordering, i. e. that Exod itself gives some indications of the $\mathfrak{M}$ order in its parent text.

Though on the whole Exod abbreviated rather than expanded the text, it usually did so on reasonable grounds. Certain omissions were apparently intentional, such as the references to the laver and its base in Part 4. On the other hand, the omission of any reference to the construction of the incense altar in either Part 2 or 3 (though it was presupposed in Part 4 where its placement is described) is not easily explained. And the regular omission of such words as קרשים and חשוקים does not presuppose a shorter parent text at all; when the translator consistently omits a translation of a difficult word, particularly when its omission yields a meaningful result, it is probably intentional.

When the translator met a difficult construction which was not fully clear, he would study the context carefully and "fill in" with something that made sense. Whether he correctly interpreted such a construction is neither here nor there; in such cases it is quite wrong to suggest that another text lay behind the Greek text.

When it comes to lists a great deal of variation is often evident. Since lists are often arbitrary, it is impossible to decide, when Exod and $\mathfrak{M}$ differ, whether the parent text was closer to Exod or not; it may well have been, but it is useless to speculate; it would be mere guesswork.

There does remain a number of instances where Exod seems to presuppose texts somewhat other than $\mathfrak{M}$, but on the whole it is unnecessary to posit a parent substantially different from the received text.

b) A second question concerns the relation of Exod B to the translator of Exodus 1—34, or more particularly and appropriately, of Exod A. Was the translator of Exod B the same as the translator of Exod A?

Strictly speaking, my answer must be: I don't know for sure, but I doubt it. Exod B did "borrow" holus-bolus from A; at least twice this is quite certain; these are 35s—9 in Part 1 from 25s—7, and in Part 2 361s—21 from 281s—21. But of more importance was the overall relationship between Exod A and B; this was rather one of full awareness on the part of Exod B of A, since as stated above the translator viewed his task as one of preparing a translation which would fit in with A to make a single whole. Occasionally B relied on A for the translation of a difficult word; thus when faced with תחש Exod B also used *θαλίπθινος*, and for שני in the phrase תולעת שני, the rendering *νενησμένος*. But more commonly Exod B would, when faced with a complex text, solve its difficulties quite independently.

But of far greater importance in determining the possible identity of the Exod B translator is a comparison of respective attitudes shown by Exod A and B to their parent texts. And here there is no great difference between the two. Both retain some freedom over against the parent text; both tend somewhat to compression. B

does omit much more than A does, but since his work was supplemental this is to be expected. B seems unconcerned at the omission of substantial blocks of material, whereas in A only a few verses in ch. 28 are not dealt with in full, but the difference is one of degree. But over against this, it must also be said that B is sometimes more detailed than A is, as e.g. in the ephod account in 36²³—29 (39¹⁶—21 in $\mathfrak{M}$) over against 28²⁴—25 (28²³—28 in $\mathfrak{M}$). Both A and B approach their texts with respect but view their task not to make word for word renderings but rather to make sense. Neither views his task as that of making a targum as an aid to the understanding of the sacred text; both try to create a text that can stand by itself.

And yet I suspect that A and B are products of two hands. Exod A does make a good ending with 34³⁵, i.e. with the account of Moses' descent from Sinai with the recopied tablets in his hands and his face shining with the reflected glory of God. Since the carrying out of the orders detailed in chh. 35—39 was largely a repetition of the details in those instructions, it might well have seemed reasonable to end the work with ch. 34.

Furthermore, there is a troubling difference between Exod A and B which makes it unlikely that A and B were made by the same translator. As was pointed out in A 8 above the orientation of the four sides of the court in Exod A was based on an Egyptian point of view; this was convincingly argued by Père Bogaert for which cf footnote at A 8. The court, 100 cubits in length and 50 cubits wide, was oriented towards the south, i.e. קדמה also called מזרחה becomes *πρὸς νότον* in Exod 27¹³; this is the front side, the side with the gate in turn with its own two sides each having three pillars. The rear side is the ים side (v. 12). The ים in Alexandria is, of course, to the north, and is rendered by *κατὰ θάλασσαν*. The long sides are נגב תימנה (v. 9) and צפון (v. 11) but become *πρὸς λίβα* "west" and *πρὸς ἀπηλιώτην* "east" resp. in Exod A. In the parallel passage in B, 38⁹—15, $\mathfrak{M}$ has exactly the same orientation as in A, but in Exod (37⁷—13) the orientation is no longer Alexandrian. The orientation is now towards the east, *τὸ πρὸς ἀνατολάς*, the side where the gate of the court is, and the rear is *τὸ πρὸς θάλασσαν*. The long sides are resp. *πρὸς λίβα* "southward" and *πρὸς βορρᾶν* "northward." The sea is no longer "north," but "west;" it is a Palestinian orientation. This does not mean that the B translator lived in Palestine since the Jews in the diaspora did know their Palestinian directions. But I find it hard to believe that the translator who translated ch. 27 using an Alexandrian point of view could also in schizophrenic fashion have translated the B account in the way in which it was done. The tentative conclusion that Exod B was created later (not necessarily much later), and by another translator seems to be a not unreasonable one.

Chapter VII: The Critical Text (Exod)

A. Exod is on the whole written in good Greek, often rendering Hebraic idioms into corresponding Greek idioms. Thus the Hebraic **כִּי וַיְהִי כִּי** and **וַיְהִי כִּי** are commonly rendered without the verb “to be;” e.g. the former is rendered simply by *ἐπειδή* at 12¹ and the latter by *ὅταν* at 32¹; comp. also *ἐάν* *δέ* for **אִם וַיְהִי אִם** at 48. Occasionally, however, the Hebraic construction is carried over into the Greek, as e.g. *καὶ ἔσται ἐάν* at 49.

That the translator understood Hebrew idiom fully is clear from his interpretation of “uncircumcised of lips” by *ἄλογος* at 61² and by *ἰσχνόφωνος* at 63⁰. At 412¹⁵ Yahweh’s promise “I will be with your mouth” is quite idiomatically translated by *ἀνοίξω τὸ στόμα σου*. So too the Hebrew **וְרֵאִיתָ עַל הָאֲבָנִים** of 116 is interpreted as *καὶ ὧσιν πρὸς τῷ τίκτειν*.

This sometimes means that the translator clarifies a difficult or obscure passage in his own way. At 425 **מ** has the highly obscure statement **לִי אֶתְּחַן דְּמַיִם אֶתְּחַן**, and in the following verse, **חֲתָן דְּמַיִם לְמוֹלֵת**. Exod has *ἔσται τὸ αἶμα τῆς περιτομῆς τοῦ παιδίου μου* in both cases; whether Exod has correctly interpreted the Hebrew may be debatable, but it is certainly much clearer. At 97 the Hebrew **וַיִּשְׁלַח פָּרְעָה וְהָנָה** is ambiguous, but Exod is not; it has *ιδὼν δὲ Φ. ὅτι*. Or at 917 where the hapax legomenon **מִסְתוֹלֵל** obtains, the Greek interprets it by using *ἐμποιῇ* with good effect, i.e. “lay claim to, hold on to” my people so as not to send them away. At 1420 after the statement “And there was the cloud and the darkness” **מ** continues with the enigmatic **וַיֹּאֲרֶה אֶת הַלֵּילָה**. For this Exod has a fully clear *καὶ διήλθεν ἡ νύξ*. The Greek cannot be used here for rewriting **מ**, since Exod is itself simply a clarification, one which fits well into its context. Sometimes such a clarification can be particularly fitting as at 216 where the master is to bring his servant to **הָאֱלֹהִים**, but Exod has *τὸ κριτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ*.

Such clarifications may be rooted in an attempt to protect the reader from misunderstanding a text literally. When Exod has *καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ* at 2410 it is saying that this is what **וַיִּרְאוּ אֶת אֱלֹהֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל** really means rather than what it actually seems to say; cf also the following verse for a similar interpretation, and comp 3320. This kind of rationalization at times serves to “correct” or “improve,” or better put, to render the facts more exactly. At 1311 **מ** refers to the promise of land in the following format: As he swore to you and to your fathers. Exod presents a more factual statement by not rendering “to you and;” the promise had been made to the patriarchs and not to the contemporary generation of Israelites.

The translation is, however, not always felicitous; at times, it is simply wrong. Striking is the confusion in Exod between the wife of Moses named **צִפּוֹרָה** and the midwife **שִׁפְרָה**, both of which occur as *Σεπφωρα* in Exod. Mistranslations may be based on a misread word as at 38 where the land of promise is called “good and spa-

cious" but Exod has ἀγαθὴν καὶ πολλήν, a misreading of ורחבה as ורבה. Or at 431 where ℳ has: And the people believed "and recognized" that Yahweh had visited, Exod has . . . believed "and rejoiced," probably misreading וישמחו as וישמעו. Misreading or misunderstanding of the Hebrew text is particularly frequent in the tabernacle accounts.

A frequently occurring characteristic of the translator's task¹⁾ is his leveling the text not only within the immediate context but also within the context of the book and even of the Pentateuch as a whole. The list of nations occupying the land of promise which will be driven out always include the Girgashites in Exod even though ℳ never includes them. This does not mean that the parent text was longer; it simply reflects the translator's leveling with Deut 71. Such leveling is especially evident in smaller contexts. In 929 not only will ἡ χάλαζα no longer obtain, but it is also true of ὁ ὑετός (against ℳ), because v. 33 which related the answer to the prayer includes both הברד ומטר. At 94 it is Yahweh who is speaking; accordingly the inappropriate third person statement הפלה יהוה is rendered by παραδοξάσω (for the root פלג). In the same verse ℳ refers to the distinction between the cattle of ישראל and the cattle of מצרים. Exod transposes the two, probably because in v. 6 the lot of the cattle of Egypt (or Egyptians) is mentioned before that of the cattle of Israel. Or to mention but one more example: at 239 the first verb is in the second masculine singular, but the remainder of the verse is in the plural. Exod has them all in the plural; comp. also v. 21 where exactly the reverse obtains.

But the dominant characteristic of Exod as a translation document is its expansionist character. On the whole Exod expands far more than contracts. Where the Hebrew is abrupt, the Greek tends to smoothen out the text. At 216 the priest of Midian had seven daughters ποιμαίνουσαι τὰ πρόβατα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν, who came and drew water. The participial phrase is added and makes the story much less abrupt. When God speaks to Moses concerning Aaron Exod regularly adds "your brother" even when ℳ does not have it (e. g. 719 85). Or note inter alia such additions as 86 he brought up the frogs καὶ ἀνεβιβάσθη ὁ βάτραχος and covered the land; 88 pray περὶ ἐμοῦ to the Lord; 89 from you καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ σου and from your houses. Such additions often can be traced to the context. At 1210 the Passover lamb must not be left to morning καὶ ὅστοῦν οὐ συντρίψετε ἀπ' αὐτοῦ; the extra clause comes from v. 46. Or cf such ex par expansions as 188: And the Lord delivered them ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραώ καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων, or in the following verse: That he had rescued them from the hand of Egypt καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραώ.

The accounts of the tabernacle constitute a special problem which will not be dealt with here. Though the plans for the tabernacle (chh. 25—31) somewhat conform to the description given above, the account of its buildings is considerably abridged and rearranged. Some of the details are discussed in the sections that fol-

¹⁾ Cf J. W. Wevers, Translation and Canonicity: A Study in the Narrative Portions of the Greek Exodus, *Scripta signa vocis: Studies about Scripts, Scriptures, Scribes and Languages in the Near East*, offered to J. H. Hospers by his pupils, colleagues and friends (Groningen 1986), 295–303.

low. It remains problematic whether the final chapters (chh. 35—40) were actually the product of the translator of chh. 1—34 or not.

B. *ἄν* / *ἐάν*

135²) *ἄν*] *εάν* A B F M^{txt} 58-426-oI⁻⁽¹³⁵⁾ 708 C^{''-25 126 422} 19' f x 121 z-128 55 59 319; > 708 126 527 318

Εάν cannot be correct. Nowhere else does *εάν* occur after *ἡνίκα* in Exod, nor would one expect it in the third century B.C. in Egypt, particularly not in literary texts. So too *ἄν* rather than *εάν* has been adopted in relative clauses for the critical text as was done for the latter books of the Pentateuch; cf THGD 99—102. Accordingly the Ra text has also been corrected at 122 49 511 127 1312 165 twice 1623 twice 2024 2117³⁰ 2316.

Another characteristic of the critical text is the lack of crasis. Cf 39 *καὶ ἐγώ*] *καγω* B 15'-58' f z 130 799 Cyr Ad 240 = Ra

Though crasis of *καί* and *ἐγώ* is well-attested as early as the third century B.C. in the papyri (cf Mayser I 1.137) it is extremely rare in the LXX, and non-existent in Exod. On the other hand, *καὶ ἐγώ* does occur elsewhere in Exod (412¹⁵ 65 316). In fact, crasis is avoided almost entirely throughout the Pentateuch.

C. Occasionally the original text has been subject to fairly substantial reinterpretation in the textual tradition.

423 *εἰ μὲν οὖν μὴ βούλει*] *συ δε ουκ* (ου 527) *εβουλου* (βουλει 527) F M oI⁻¹⁵ C^{''-131c} d n s t γ⁻³⁹² 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth Arab Bo Syh^{Lmg} = *℣*

The popular variant is a literal rendering of the Hebrew *וְתָמָא*, and is surely a hebraizing correction. Exod is a much freer rendering somewhat removed from the Hebrew though not unfair to it. The Hebrew makes a statement, which Exod makes a condition, i.e. "if in fact you should be unwilling to send them away, then note that I am going to kill . . ." Note also the neat use of *οὖν* both in the protasis and the apodosis, also characteristic marks of the translator.

218 *ἦν αὐτῷ καθωμολογήσατο*] *ην ου καθ. αυτω* (litt ω sup ras A) A O-15 126; *ην ου καθ.* (c var) *αυτην* F oI-29-82 d s-30' 130mg t 121' 68' 55 59 76' 509 646 Arab Bo Syh; *ην ου καθ.* (cvar) *αυτη* (αυτην 551*) C^{''-126} 30'

There are basically two interpretations involved in the text tradition. In *℣* the subject of the verb is the master and the clause is negative. The meaning apparently is that he has not (permanently?) designated her (i.e. as his consort). Admittedly, the Hebrew text is not fully clear. What is clear is that the variant texts in the tradition

²) In presenting variant evidence throughout this chapter patristic evidence as well as spelling variants within a reading have been largely ignored; for these the edition where a complete statement is attempted may be consulted.

were influenced by the Hebrew; if they are secondary, they are corrections based on the Hebrew.

Exod has simplified the text, understanding the phrase as meaning “whom he had designated for himself;” that is, by disregarding the negative he has made a clear and consistent text. The addition of *αὐτῷ* is part of that clarification. The “corrected” text has inserted *ου*, omitted *αὐτῷ*, and added *αυτην*, all in order to equal the Hebrew but thereby obfuscating the text.

3621 ἐγγεγλυμμένοι] ἐγγεγραμμενα (ενγεγρ. B*; εγκεγρ. 619) B 118*-314 71' 55 = Ra
— σφραγιδες] εις (> O 55) σφραγιδας B O-15' 129 71' 55 = Ra

There is something radically wrong with the B text since immediately preceding this B has *εκ των ονοματων αυτων* (instead of *κατὰ τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν*); the neuter plural participle has no proper antecedent; if it were to be *ονοματων* it should agree with it, but if it were *λίθοι*, which would be the only other possibility in the clause, it should be agreeing with it.

On the other hand, Exod has a syntactically viable text. The participle modifies *σφραγιδες* and is therefore nominative feminine plural; it precedes *σφραγιδες* because the text of *℣* has פתוחי חתם. Note also in v. 13 that *γεγλυμμένους* had occurred as part of a doublet translation for מפתחת, vocalized as a Pual participle in *℣*. It is obvious that the text adopted by Ra is secondary and should in no way be taken seriously as a possible Exod text.

D. The Article

1. With proper nouns.

428 Ἀαρών] pr τω B O d^{-125*} n t 527 18 76 = Ra; pr τον 125*

In the context of ἀνήγγειλεν Μωσῆς Ἀαρών there might at least in theory be some ambiguity, though in actual fact there is none since “Moses” is inflected as nominative, and to anyone knowing the story Aaron is the brother of Moses. Thus neither a genitive relationship nor an accusative is rational; after ἀνήγγειλεν only a dative is possible. *℣* has לאהרן and hex at times added the dative article to designate the preposition. Since the support for the article is mainly hex and Byzantine witnesses, it seems almost certain that the *τω* is a secondary hex addition.

68 Ἰσαάκ] pr τω M O^{-72 82' 708} 57-cII-126 615 761 b 56'-129 n⁻⁷⁵ s t y 128' 18 55 59 76' 130 509 646
— Ἰακώβ] pr τω M O^{-72 82' 708} C^{-16 126 615 761} b 56'-129 n⁻⁷⁵ s t y 120'-128' 18 55 59 130 509 646
331 Ἰσαάκ] pr τω b 107' 129 127 74-76 Ath II 560 Cyr VI 648 IX 729
— Ἰακώβ] pr τω b 107' 129 127 t⁻⁸⁴ Ath II 560 Cyr VI 648 IX 729

The context has τῷ Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ. The collocation occurs only in these two verses. Instructive for the style of Exod is the occurrence in 24 and 63 of

a similar one, viz., *πρὸς Ἀβραὰμ καὶ Ἰσαὰκ καὶ Ἰακώβ*. In all the cases only the first in the list is preceded by *πρὸς* or *τῷ*, and there is no doubt that this is original text.

1430 *Αἰγυπτίων*] pr *των* B 58'-82-381' 126-551-552 f75 30' 392-527 120-128'-628 55 130 508 799 = Ra

מצרים is often rendered by *οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι* rather than by *Αἴγυπτος* in Exod. In the nominative it occurs 19 times; the dative, seven; the accusative, 10 times, and in the genitive 31 times. It is always articulated except in the phrase "from the hand of the Egyptians." This occurs five times in Exod. The other four examples of *ἐκ χειρὸς (τῶν) Αἰγυπτίων* with variation on articulation are

38 *Αἰγυπτίων*] pr *των* 72-618 57-126 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ 619 527 128 Cyr Ad 237
 188 *τῶν Αἰγυπτίων*] om *τῶν* 75 121 68'
 189 *Αἰγυπτίων*] pr *των* A M C''-(126) 414° 107' 56'-129 121-392 68' 18 46 76 646^(ms) 799
 1810 *Αἰγυπτίων*] pr *των* 58'-oII⁻¹⁵ 54-126-414' b f n⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ 85'-130 318' 68'-120' 646' Cyr Ad 280

Of these four only 188 has the article, whereas for the others the unarticulated noun has been taken as critical text. Exod apparently preferred the unarticulated form, thereby following the Hebrew text. It should also be noted that in the exception to the pattern, 188, there is no equivalent in *℣* for the phrases *ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραὼ καὶ ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων*. Why Exod should have omitted the article only in these four instances where the above phrase obtained is not clear, but the unarticulated noun is obviously original. One might plausibly argue that at 188 the unarticulated noun ought also to be adopted; this might well be correct but with only four mss. attesting the shorter text it was felt overly daring to adopt it.

In this connection the following case should also be considered.

1212 *τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων* B 29-82' 19' f⁻²⁴⁶ 392-527 120-128' 76' 130 799 Bo Sa³] om *τοῖς* 71'; om *τῶν* 72 318; *θεοὶς αἰγυπτίων* rel

It is obvious that the double articulation is a single problem. In view of the pattern shown for the articulation of *Αἰγυπτίων* above one can with some confidence accept the B+ reading in 1212 as the original text.

336 *τοῦ Χωρήβ*] om *τοῦ* A F M' oI-29 C'-57' b 44'-125 53' s x y 126'-128'-628 18 46 55 59 319 509 646

The phrase modifies *τοῦ ὄρους* and the proper name can be either articulated or unarticulated. At 31 the phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄρος Χωρήβ* (with 53' adding a second article) occurs. Though *Χωρήβ* obtains as a modifier of a noun only in these two instances in Exod, the articulated form is probably original text here particularly in view of the usage after *ὄρος* of *Σινά* as the following discussion shows.

191 *τοῦ (Σινά)*] *την* 130^{ms}-321^{ms} n; > A F O'-15(*) C''-25 b 125 30'-85-130^{txt}-321^{txt}-344 84 x 121-527 68' 55 59 646

192 *τοῦ (Σινά)*] pr *την* 318; *την* 127; > 15-376' 246 n⁻¹²⁷ 30 527 59 646

The Hebrew word סני being a proper noun is never articulated, but it is in Exod with the exception of 161 in the phrase *ἀνὰ μέσον Αἰλὶμ καὶ ἀνὰ μέσον Σινά*, which obviously had to remain unarticulated to contrast with *Αἰλὶμ*, and of 1916 *ἐπ' ὄρους Σινά* where *Σινά* has no support in *℣*, and is sub ÷ in Syh.

The phrase *ἐρημον τοῦ Σινά* occurs only here and contrasts with *τὴν ἐρημον Σίν* at

16₁ 17₁ which is always unarticulated. The remaining evidence for Exod is as follows.

- 19₁₁ (τὸ ὄρος) τὸ (Σινά)] > A 58'-381' 25*-52-73-413 d 53'-56* 730 527
 19₁₈ (τὸ δὲ ὄρος) τὸ (Σινά)] > A 72-707 413 19 53' 46
 19₂₀ (τὸ ὄρος) τὸ (Σινά)] > A F 58'-381'-707 C-57-126*-414' 106-125 53'
 19₂₃ (τὸ ὄρος) τὸ (Σινά)] > 381' cI-126 106 53' 75 730 128 18 55 509; om τὸ Σινά 58'
 24₁₆ (τὸ ὄρος) τὸ (Σινά)] > A 15-72-381' 19 106 128 59 Phil Ex II 44
 31₁₈ (ἐν τῷ ὄρει) τῷ (Σινά)] > F O-⁷⁶⁷-64*-707¹ 107'-125 f-¹²⁹ 319 426
 34₂ (τὸ ὄρος) τὸ (Σινά)] > 552 106-125 509
 34₄ (τὸ ὄρος) τὸ (Σινά)] > 44'-125 46
 34₃₂ (ἐν τῷ ὄρει) τῷ (Σινά) 72-708 422 75 30'-85^{mg}-130^{mg}-346^{mg} 426] > rell

Only the last instance might be considered questionable since the evidence for Exod is meagre. In view of the pattern which the translator followed in always articulating Σινά unless stylistic reasons demanded the lack of an article, it seems valid to adopt τῷ Σινά for 34₃₂.

The establishment of this pattern also helps to determine the text of Exod at 34₂₉ τοῦ ὄρους 1° B 15-707 n 71' 392 55 426 Chr XV 444 Cyr Gl 536 Or IV 471 ^{Lat}cod 100 Sa] + σινα (cvar) rell = **℞**. The variant text cannot be original; no witness shows the articulated form, and that it is hex in origin is fully clear; Origen of course did not articulate the word since the Hebrew has יְנִי.

Incidentally when one examines the text of Lev the pattern is the opposite. Σινά occurs five times in the phrase ἐν τῷ ὄρει Σινά (7₂₈ twice 25₁ 26₄₆ 27₃₄), and it is always unarticulated as in Hebrew. On the other hand, in Num no real pattern emerges, though the unarticulated form is dominant. The phrase ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ Σινά occurs at 3₄ 14 9₁ 5 26₆₄ 33₁₅; ἐν ὄρει Σινά occurs at 3₁, and ἐκ τῆς ἐρήμου Σινά at 33₁₆. But Σινά is articulated in the phrase ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τῇ Σινά at 1₁ 19 and in ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ τοῦ Σινά at 10₁₂.

36₂ τὸν Βεσελεήλ] om τὸν B O'-²⁹ (376) b 392 55 = Ra

The article is probably original since it would hardly have been introduced in the later tradition. It is helpful to the reader in that it makes clear where the subject (Μωσῆς) ends and the modifier of the verb begins. This is often done when the proper noun is not inflected. The accusative article is not repeated before Ἐλιάβ since its grammatical function is now fully obvious. Whether the omission of the article in the tradition was due to Hebrew influence is not clear. It may well be simply due to scribal error. After all, τὸν is not necessary for the sense of the passage.

Article before "Moses" in the dative.

The evidence for Μωσῆ without the article in Exod is as follows: In each case the lemma is Μωσῆ. 22₁ pr τω M 426-707 84 527 18; 31₂ pr τω 72 z 130 799; 41₈ pr τω F M O'-29-135 C'' 19' 107' n s t 121-527 18 55 59 76' 509; 42₇ pr τω 646*; 52₀ pr τω 527; 62₈ pr τω 426 121-392; 14₃₁ omnes; 162₂ pr τω 527 55; 18₆ pr τω 246; 18₁₃ pr τω 376; 24₁ pr τω 29 68' 424; 31₁₈ omnes; 33₉ pr (※Syh^L) τω 126-128' Syh; 37₁₉ pr τω M' oI-^{64*} C'' 53' s 527 68'-120' 18 59 319 799.

Over against these cases τῷ Μωσῆ occurs in the following instances: 9₃₅ τῷ

Μωνσῆ] om τῷ A oI C''-25 (126) 422 761 30'-343' 71 121 z; 12₂₈ om τῷ 76; 12₅₀ om τῷ 53'; 16₃₄ omnes; 36₈ om τῷ 458; 36_{12 14 29} omnes; 36₃₄ om τῷ 458; 36_{37 40} omnes; 37₂₀ omnes; 38₂₇ om τῷ 458; 39₁₁ omnes; 39₂₂ om τῷ B 15-82^c 19' 55*; 39₂₃ om τῷ 15; 40_{17 19} omnes; 40₂₁ om τῷ 130*; 40_{23 25} omnes.

Certain facts seem to emerge from the distribution of the articulated versus the unarticulated proper noun. Of the 14 instances of the unarticulated noun only one occurs in the last six chapters of the book, and the exception, 37₁₉ might be considered uncertain since 44 mss witness to the articulated noun. On the other hand, of the 21 instances of the articulated noun all but four are in the final section.

But this says nothing about translators, only something about translation technique since everyone of those that have the articulated form represent *אֵת מֹשֶׁה*; thus the article represents *אֵת*. On the other hand, only once is the *אֵת* not represented, viz. in 5₂₀ where the text of *אֵת* is not at all in question.

2. Articulation of *νίος* in the plural.

The phrase *νιοὶ Ἰσραήλ* occurs 35 times in the nominative, 26 times in the dative, and 24 times in the accusative in Exod. The nominative *νιοί* lacks articulation only in ch. 6 when modified by *Πουβήν* (14), *Συμεών* (15), *Καάθ* (18), *Μεραρί* (19), *Ἰσαάκ* (21), *Ὀζιήλ* (22) and *Κόρε* (24). In the dative *νιότης* is always articulated, and the accusative lacks the article only in the phrases *νιότης ἣ θυγατέρας* (21₄) and *νιότης Ἀαρών* (28₁).

The genitive phrase *νιῶν Ἰσραήλ* occurs 53 times in Exod, but lacks the article only 12 times. These together with their variants are (the lemma is always *νιῶν Ἰσραήλ*).

- 12₃ pr τῶν 500 53'-56^c-129 127 527
- 12₆ pr τῶν A 422 125'-610^c 56 527
- 12₄₇ pr τῶν 121' 68'
- 16₁ pr τῶν 71
- 16₂ pr τῶν f-56^{*} 318
- 16₆ pr τῶν 74
- 16_{9 10} omnes
- 17₁ pr τῶν 707 318
- 35₁ pr τῶν 761* 314
- 35₄ pr τῶν 509
- 35₂₀ pr τῶν 25 107'-125 127 730

In each case the phrase modifies a form of *συναγωγή* immediately preceding it. Furthermore these are all the instances in which *νιῶν Ἰσραήλ* follows a form of *συναγωγή* in Exod. Obviously this is the conditioning factor for the lack of articulation.

3. Article used as a relative pronoun.

7₁₂ om ἡ 2° 15-72-376-707-oI C'' b d f n 321-343 t x y-392 68'-128' 18 55 130 509 646' Co Syh = *אֵת*

The context is *ἡ ῥάβδος ἡ Ἀαρών*, and the translator adds *ἡ* after *ῥάβδος* to heighten the contrast between Aaron's staff and the staves of the Egyptian magi. This is also brought out by the preposing of *ἐκείνων* to the noun in *τάς ἐκείνων ῥάβδους*, thus heightening the contrast of "one" vs "them."

1916 *ὁ 2°*] *ος ην d 56' n t* = Compl; > A 29-72-82*-376 414'-422 *b s x* 392-527 59 799 Aeth Syh

There is no real doubt that Ra was correct in adopting the article as the original translation of the relative pronoun *אשר*. Its omission is simply a matter of haplography of the omicron in an uncial script where it follows *λαός*. The variant *ος ην* constitutes a Byzantine correction.

338 *σκηνήν 1°*] + *την* (> B 29 314 *z*-¹²⁸ 46 Aeth = Ra) *εξω της παρεμβολης* B M' *οΙ'-707* 73'-550' *b 44 f* 18 *z*(-¹²⁸) 18 46 55 799 Aeth Co = Ra

There is no basis for the gloss represented by the variant text in *℣*, nor is it original. The phrase immediately preceding it is *εἰς τὴν σκηνήν*, and the source of the gloss is clear. It occurs in that same environment though without *την* at the end of the preceding clause (v. 7), where it makes good sense, whereas here it is palpably repetitive. The shorter text is certainly Exod.

4. Often the unarticulated form is to be preferred.

36 *θεός 2°*] *pr o* A 15-64*-72-376 *C''-54 b* 106 *n x* 121-527 *z* 18 76 130 424 509 799 Matth 2232 Marc 1226 Act 732
 — *θεός 3°* A B F M 58-426-*οΙ'-15* 135 44 *t* 318' 55 59 319 Marc 1226^{te} Act 732^{ap}] > 72 422 107'-125 *n*-⁴⁵⁸ 619 76 799 Act 732^{te}; *pr o* rell
 — *θεός 4°* A B F M 58-426-*οΙ'-15* 135 19 44 *t* 318' 55 59 319 Marc 1226^{te} Act 732^{ap}] > 72 422 107'-125 *n*-⁴⁵⁸ 619 799 Act 732^{te}; *pr o* rell

The phrase "God of Abraham and God of Isaac and God of Jacob" occurs four times in Exod, it also occurring at 315 16 45. Each time it occurs without an article before *θεός*, though in all cases the tradition has extensively added articles. In other contexts where *θεός* (or *θεοῦ*) occurs with a genitive noun following it, it is always articulated except at 152 *θεός τοῦ πατρός μου*, but this is poetic in character. In fact, even the phrase in question is in each case preceded by a phrase containing *ὁ θεός*, i. e. *ὁ θεός τοῦ πατρός σου* or *ὁ θεός τῶν πατέρων ὑμῶν*.

824 *γῆν*] *pr την* B 15-29-72-381-708 *C''-126* 53'-246 *x* 318-527 509 646' = Ra
 99 *γῆν*] *pr την* B 82-135 25 *d*-¹²⁵ *f* 75' 85' *t*-⁸⁴ 120' = Ra

The full phrase is *πᾶσαν γῆν Αἰγύπτου*. After *πᾶς* the noun *γῆ* is articulated only when it is not modified by *Αἰγύπτου*. Thus *πᾶσα ἡ γῆ* at 195, *πάσης τῆς γῆς* at 822 and *πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ταύτην* at 3213. With *Αἰγύπτου* the accusative *πᾶσαν γῆν* also occurs at 922 23 1014 22 116, whereas the dative (*ἐν*) *πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου* obtains at 719 21 816 17 99 11 25 1015 19. It is clear that the article at 824 and 99 is in both cases secondary.

Evidence for *γῆ* unmodified by *πᾶσα* in Exod is as follows. With the genitive *ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου* occurs 24 times, and *ὁδὸν γῆς Φυλιστιμ* at 1317. For the accusative the

following occur: 3₈ εἰς γῆν ἀγαθήν; 8₆ τὴν γῆν Αἰγύπτου] om τὴν 707*; 8₇ 10_{12 21} ἐπὶ γῆν Αἰγύπτου; 8₂₂ τὴν γῆν Γέσση] om γῆν 54-414'; 2₁₅ εἰς γῆν Μαδιάν; 16₃₅ εἰς γῆν οἰκουμένην; 3₁₇ 33₃ εἰς γῆν ῥέουσιν; 13₅ γῆν ῥέουσιν; 3₁₇ εἰς τὴν γῆν τῶν Χανααίων] om τὴν 628; 6₄ 13_{5 11} εἰς (> 6₄) τὴν γῆν τῶν Χανααίων.

The pattern of usage is clear. Except for instances in which γῆν is modified by τῶν Χανααίων the noun γῆ is not articulated when it is modified by a noun or adjective. Only one exception obtains at 8₆, but since the evidence for the article is almost universal, it must be accepted as critical text.

10₉ πρεσβυτέροις B 82' f⁻²⁴⁶ x 527 120-128'-628 130 799] pr τοῖς rell

The B text preserves the pattern of the original translator in using the article only when it is prefixed by the preposition σύν. Thus σύν τοῖς νεανίσκοις and σύν τοῖς υἱοῖς, but simply καὶ πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ θυγατράσιν, καὶ προβάτοις and καὶ βουσίν.

12₄₁ μετά] + τα A B 707 664 t 318-527 120-128' 59 130 509 = Ra

The τα of the variant text is a dittograph and should not be considered seriously for the critical text. One could point out that the 430 years had just been mentioned and that the article in the phrase "after the 430 years" is present, but this is specious. The designation μετὰ plus a number of years does not normally use an article, and in spite of its support by both codd A and B it is to be rejected.

19₁₇ συνάντησιν] pr την A B^c M Oⁿ⁻⁷² C^{n-126s} 552 44-107' f n s t 392-527 120'-128'-628 18 46

The noun is governed by εἰς and the phrase is the translation of לקראת. The phrase occurs five times in Exod, always rendering the same expression, and never with an article (also occurring at 4_{14 27} 5₂₀ 18₇); in fact, in none of these cases is it articulated in the text tradition except for 4₂₇ where ms 25 does have εἰς την συναντήσιν. The conclusion that Ra is correct in rejecting the article here is borne out by the usage pattern in Exod.

20₁₈ καπνίζον] pr το A B 56'-129 120'-128'-628 426 509 = Ra

The context is ὁ λαὸς ἑώρα . . . τὸ ὄρος καπνίζον. $\mathfrak{M}$ has והעם ראים . . . ואת ההר עשן, i.e. the Exod text represents $\mathfrak{M}$ word for word. The introduction of the article modifying the participle is a smoothing out of the text; it makes a neat attributive phrase, but it is secondary. What is surprising is that the article did not gain wider acceptance since it seems an obviously stylistic correction.

26₃ ἑτέρα ἐκ τῆς ἑτέρας 1°] pr η B^(ms) 82 f x 68'-120' 55 = Ra

The collocation "ἕτερος over against another" occurs six times in Exod and in each case the second ἕτερος is articulated and the first one never is. In fact, only here is there any variation in the tradition with respect to the articulation of the first one (also occurs at 16₁₅ 26₃-2° 6 17 28₇). The B^(ms) support is not from B itself but forms part of a marginal restoration of a larger omission due to homoioteleuton.

34₂₅ ἐορτῆς] pr της B 552 n⁻¹²⁷ = Ra

Usage is inconsistent in Exod on the articulation of *ἐορτή* when modified by a genitive, though the unarticulated word is more common. Since only four mss support the article, it seemed prudent not to adopt it as critical text.

3435 κάλυμμα B 836(vid) 15-58-707-767 129 n 68'-120' 55 426 Cyr Gl 536] κατακαλ. b; (✱ Syh) το (εις 71*) κάλυμμα (καταλ. 82) rell = **℞**

Syh has *lthpyt'* under the asterisk with σ' θ' given as the source. Presumably the metobelus is misplaced, and the asterisk should govern only the *l-* which is probably meant to represent the article, since **℞** has המסה. Exod accordingly had κάλυμμα without an article which Origen in turn added.

3721 φυλῆς] pr της B M' 15c-82 d-106 129* n-75 130 t 527 392 18 55 426 = Ra

In the preceding verse in the same context (ἐκ φυλῆς) Ra accepted the unarticulated noun, though a της was supported by F M' O"-376 C" b d-106 56'-129 n s t x 318' z-126 18 46 55 59 319 509 799, that is, only A B 376 106 53' 121 126 426 lack the article. The same contexts obtain in the following two cases:

3530 φυλῆς] pr της A F M' O-29' C" d f-129 127 s t 527 y z 18 46 319 509 799

3534 φυλῆς] pr της F M' oI-29 C" d-125 f s t 71' 318' 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 799

Since in these three cases the unarticulated φυλῆς was accepted as Exod it is likely that it should also be original at 3721.

386 δύο] pr τους B 15 19' 129 n 71' 318' 68'-120' 55 426 = Ra

The phrase in which the number occurs is δύο χειρουβὶμ χρυσοῦς. That the phrase was unarticulated in Exod seems clear. If one examines the chapter, one notes that whenever something is referred to as made or cast or placed and it is modified by a number such as "four rings," "two cherubs," the phrase is unarticulated, whereas should no number be given, it is usually articulated. Accordingly the τους reading is probably to be taken as secondary.

3826 χαλκοῦν B 15-707 118'-537 127 55 426] χαλκον Fh; χρυσουν 551; pr τον rell

If one investigates the usage of the adjective χαλκοῦς (as opposed to the noun) in Exod it appears that it was used 26 times, of which 21 represent the Hebrew נחשת designating the material of which something was made, cast, or plated. Only once is the Hebrew noun articulated in **℞**. In 3824 (comp **℞** 56) the reference is to τοῦ παραθέματος τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου χαλκοῦς whereas **℞** has למכבר הנחשת. The τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου has no counterpart. The Hebrew is then followed by v. 6 all of which is absent from the Greek. The verse ends with נחשת (i. e. unarticulated) and it is fully possible that the careless translator overlooked the line because of the recurring word. In any event the adjective is unarticulated. In all the other 20 cases Exod in imitation of **℞** left the adjective unarticulated. Why he should have used the adjective instead of the noun (as he does elsewhere) is baffling. The adjective occurs five times without an equivalent in **℞** (3819 20 26 twice 3910). At 3819 χαλκοῦς obtains; it is not articulated since the noun it modifies, κρίκους, is also minus an article. The other four are all articulated simply as attributive adjectives. It seems clear that the transla-

tor never articulated this adjective when the Hebrew parent text had נחשת. So too at 38¹⁷ the popular reading *τον χαλκουν* must be secondary.

5. List of nations in the land of promise.

The list of nations which are to be driven out from the promised land occurs at 38¹⁷ 13⁵ 23²³ 28 33² and 34¹¹. *ℳ* has six nations in all cases except at 13⁵ (five) and 23²⁸ (three). The Hebrew evidence is as follows.

- 38¹⁷ הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והפרזי והחוי והיבوسی
 13⁵ הכנעני והחתי והאמרי והחוי והיבوسی
 23²³ האמרי והחתי והפרזי והכנעני החוי והיבوسی
 23²⁸ את החוי את הכנעני ואת החתי
 33² את הכנעני האמרי והחתי והפרזי החוי והיבوسی
 34¹¹ את האמרי והכנעני והחתי והפרזי והחוי והיבوسی

It should be noted that each noun is articulated, and that only 23²⁸ has את governing each noun as well. The order is not always the same, but the list is limited to Canaanite, Hittite, Amorite, Perezite, Hivite and Jebusite. The same list obtains at Deut 7¹ Ios 3¹⁰ 24¹¹ but with the addition of Girgashite.

The Greek evidence is as follows:

- 38 τῶν Χαναναίων καὶ Χετταίων καὶ Ἀμορραίων καὶ Φερεζαίων καὶ Εὐαίων καὶ Γεργεσαίων καὶ Ἰεβουσαίων
 317 τῶν Χαναναίων καὶ Χετταίων καὶ Εὐαίων καὶ Ἀμορραίων καὶ Φερεζαίων καὶ Γεργεσαίων καὶ Ἰεβουσαίων
 23²³ τὸν Ἀμορρ. καὶ Χεττ. καὶ Φερεζ. καὶ Χαναν. καὶ Γεργεσ. καὶ Εὐαῖον καὶ Ἰεβουσ.
 34¹¹ τὸν Ἀμορρ. καὶ Χαναν. καὶ Χεττ. καὶ Φερεζ. καὶ Εὐαῖον καὶ Γεργεσ. καὶ Ἰεβουσ.

In each case only the first noun is articulated, the order of *ℳ* is followed (except at 317), but “the Girgashite” is inserted: as no. 6 at 38¹⁷ 34¹¹, as no. 5 at 23²³.

The remaining three present problems. 13⁵ shows a popular order which follows the order of *ℳ* with τῶν Χαναν. καὶ Χεττ. καὶ Ἀμορρ. καὶ Εὐαίων καὶ Ἰεβουσ. and adds at the end καὶ Γεργεσ. καὶ Φερεζ., thereby making the list of seven complete. Ra follows B 82 f 120-128'-628 130 799 Sa with the order 1 2 4 3 5 but with the Girgashite between 4 and 3 and with the Perezite between 3 and 5. Since the popular order follows *ℳ* with the extras added at the end, it seems likely that this constitutes a hexaplaric reordering of materials. The text adopted by Ra is clearly original.

23²⁸ τοὺς Ἀμορραίους καὶ τοὺς Εὐαίους καὶ τοὺς Χαναναίους καὶ τοὺς Χετταίους

No. 1 is not present in *ℳ* but the others = *ℳ*. In contrast to the other lists all are articulated because each noun is governed by את in *ℳ*.

It should also be noted that C⁷⁻⁷⁷ 246 s 646 Bo add the three τοὺς φερεζαίους καὶ τοὺς γεργεσαίους καὶ τοὺς ιεβουσαίους at the end of the verse thereby making the list of seven nations complete.

33² τὸν Ἀμορραῖον καὶ Χεττ. καὶ Φερεζ. καὶ Γεργεσ. καὶ Εὐαῖον καὶ Ἰεβουσ.

Again καὶ Γεργεσ. has been added, this time as no. 4, but no. 1 “the Canaanite” is absent. It has been added with articulation at the beginning (with or without a con-

junction) by A F M' O'-767-29 *d t x* 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 ^{Lat}Aug Ex 150 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh, undoubtedly a hex plus.

It should be noted that for nos. 4—6, 767 C'-57' *n s* 318 426 646 ^{Lat}codd 100 104 substitute (cvar) *τον ευαιον και τον ιεβουσ. και τον χαναν. και τον γεργεσ.*, that is, the absent Canaanite has been added, and the Gergashite placed at the end. Its secondary character is also obvious from the fact that all nouns are articulated, whereas the pattern of articulating only the first in a list except where אַת also occurs in the parent text is clearly characteristic of Exod.

6. At times it is the articulated form that is original text.

1826 τό 1°] *και παν* 72; *παν* B 58-82' *f n* 318' 120'-128'-628 ^{Lat}cod 104 Sa = Ra
— τό 2°] > B 58'-82' *f n* 392 120'-128'-628 = Ra

The two citations constitute a single variant. $\mathfrak{M}$ reads אַת הדבר הקשה which Exod renders by τὸ δὲ ῥῆμα τὸ ὑπέρογκον. This is contrasted with πᾶν δὲ ῥῆμα ἐλαφρόν as rendering *הקמן הדבר* וכּל. Exod, which is on the whole careful to observe precisely the kind of distinction which $\mathfrak{M}$ shows, rendered the two phrases accurately. The leveling process by which the two phrases would be exactly parallel, is the kind of process which is typical of the text tradition. In other words, some scribe probably quite unconsciously, revised the first phrase to conform to the second.

2610 τὴν (συμβολήν)] > B 15-72-376-οΙ = Ra

The phrase *κατὰ τὴν συμβολήν* also occurs at 265 3628 and in other prepositional phrases (*εἰς* 264 3625; *πρὸς* 264) and without preposition at 2828. The noun is always articulated; even the text tradition is almost unanimous, with the article being omitted only by 52'-313' at 2828 and by 551 53 at 3628. That B plus a few mss from the O' tradition should here alone witness to the original text is highly unlikely. The loss of the article is simply a scribal mistake and should not be taken seriously.

2625 αἱ B 707^c-767 *d n t z*-126 426] > rell

The context reads *καὶ αἱ βάσεις αὐτῶν* and the omission of the article in the majority of mss is the result of haplography. Whenever *βάσις* occurs in oblique cases it is always articulated except after a number such as *πέντε βάσεις* (accusative) 2637, and at 3018 where the indefiniteness of the noun is called for: "make . . . a bronze basis."

It is only after *καί* that the *αἱ* is often omitted in the tradition. All cases of *καὶ αἱ βάσεις* are listed below together with the relevant variants, i.e. the omission of *αἱ*.

2632	omnes
2710	om <i>αἱ</i> A F O'-58 19' <i>d</i> 127 <i>s t</i> 527 126 76' 509
2711(1°)	om <i>αἱ</i> 74-370
2711(2°)	omnes
2712	om <i>αἱ</i> A F ^b 29-82 <i>b</i> 56' <i>s</i> -343 <i>t x y z</i> -630 55 76' 426 509
2713	om <i>αἱ</i> A F 29-64'-82-376 57'-73(mg)-78-cII(-52' 761) 19 <i>d s</i> (-730) <i>t y</i> (-318) <i>z</i> (-628) 55 426 509
2714	om <i>αἱ</i> A F ^b M 58-64'-376 C''-25 413 (500 761) 19' 610* 75 <i>s x y z</i> 18 55 59 426

27 ¹⁵	om <i>ai</i> A F M 376-708- <i>oII</i> -707 16-52'-414'-550'-761 19' 56' <i>s x y z</i> (-126 128) 18 55 59 426 509
27 ¹⁶	om <i>ai</i> A F M 15'-58-376 <i>b d</i> 56' 127 <i>s t x y z</i> 18 46 ^(e) 55 76' 799
27 ¹⁷	om <i>ai</i> 392
27 ¹⁸	om <i>ai</i> B 68'-120'
374	omnes
376	<i>ai</i> aut <i>τας</i> omnes
378	om <i>ai</i> F ^h
379	omnes
37 ¹⁰	om <i>ai</i> A O-707 14-131- <i>cI</i> ' <i>s</i> -321 71 <i>y</i> -318 55 319
37 ¹²	om <i>ai</i> F ^{h2}
37 ¹³	om <i>ai</i> F ^{h2} 82 71' 55
37 ¹⁷	om <i>ai</i> F ^h

It is abundantly clear that only the fact that *και* preceded *ai* has created a situation in which the omission of the article was easily stimulated. One can with confidence accept *ai* before *βάσεις* (nom.) in all instances in Exod.

26²⁷ *τῷ* (*κλίτει*) 2° B M^{ms} 82 52'-57-761 19' 129 55] > *rell*

The word *κλίτος* occurs 33 times in Exod in various cases both in singular and plural and it is never left unarticulated. In this case it follows *ὀπισθίῳ* and the erroneous omission of *τῷ* is probably palaeographically inspired. The sense of the passage also demands an article in Greek, i.e. "the side of the tent which was towards the sea;" the first article is necessary and though weakly supported by the mss must be Exod.

28²¹ om *τάς* B 82 44 55 = Ra

Only undue reverence for the text of B could compel adoption of the unarticulated phrase *δώδεκα φυλάς* by Ra. The phrase would normally be articulated in Greek. In fact, *εἰς* phrases in Exod commonly contain the article (174 times). Nominals governed by *εἰς* are usually articulated in Exod unless there is a good reason not to do so, such as pronouns, indefinite expressions or nouns modified by genitive pronouns. This pattern is also observable for other prepositions such as *ἀπό*, *ἐκ*, *ἐν*, *ἐπί*, *κατά*, *παρά*, and *ὕπό*, though not *πρός*.

29⁴² *τὰς θύρας*] om *τάς* B *oII*-29 = Ra; *θυραις* Or IV 161

The omission of the article is clearly secondary. The word *θύρα* occurs 25 times in Exod and never is it unarticulated, regardless of what *XX* has (usually without the article since it is often bound to *הא*). The sparse support should also make one wary of accepting the unarticulated noun as original text. This is also the case with *γενεάς* appearing in the immediately preceding phrase: *εἰς τὰς γενεάς*] om *τάς* B *oII*-29 125 127 55 = Ra.

In this case, however, the situation is not so clear. The phrase *εἰς (τὰς) γενεάς ὕμῶν* occurs 13 times in Exod. The articulated phrase is supported by all witnesses at 16³² 33 27²¹ 31¹³. Almost complete support also obtains at 31¹⁶ (om *τάς* 707 527) and 40¹³ (om *τάς* 646). Unanimous support for the unarticulated phrase obtains at 12⁴², whereas at 12¹⁷ the unarticulated phrase is original: (*εἰς*) *γενεάς ὕμῶν*] *pr τας oI C*"

246 n 30'-85' x 121-527 68' 130 509 646. In the remaining instances the articulated phrase is original.

1214 *εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν*] om *τάς b*

308 *εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν*] om *τάς B M^{txt} 15'-64^{txt} 127 527(2°) z 18 46^s 426 = Ra*

3010 *εἰς τὰς γενεὰς αὐτῶν*] om *τάς B*

3031 *εἰς τὰς γενεὰς ὑμῶν*] om *τάς 707 53'-56 527 426 799*

In none of these cases is the original text in doubt including that of 2942.

2936 *τῆς ἁμαρτίας B O⁻⁵⁸-15 53' 730 68'-120' 55 646 L^{at}cod 100 Syh]* pr *το* rell

The Hebrew word is *חַטָּאת*, but not in the sense of “sin” but rather of “sin offering.” It occurs three times as such in Exodus. In 2914 *חַטָּאת הָרֹא* refers to those parts of the ram’s carcass which are to be burned outside the camp, after which this is thus defined. Exod renders by *ἁμαρτίας γάρ ἐστιν*; n.b. the use of the genitive. The word also occurs at 3010 where Aaron is to make annual atonement on the horns of the altar *חַטָּאת מִדָּם*. The translator’s difficulty with the word is clear from his translation *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ καθαρισμοῦ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν*.

In 2936 *חַטָּאת פָּר* can be literally rendered by *τὸ μοσχάριον τῆς ἁμαρτίας* and the translator did so, but the problem remained. A later translator, Lev, had to face the problem head on since the usage in Leviticus was very common, and he did it by prefixing the article used as a relative pronoun before the genitive phrase, a rather neat solution; cf THGL 78. Later scribes who knew the distinction between *τῆς ἁμαρτίας* and *τὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας* were then responsible for introducing the *το*, thereby “elucidating” the text.

3535 *τὰ ποικιλτά]* om *τά B O⁻²⁹767 610 129 127 x 416^c = Ra*

The unarticulated noun can hardly be original since the phrase *καὶ τὰ ποικιλτά* is balanced by the coordinate phrase immediately preceding it, viz. *καὶ τὰ ὑφαντά*. The translator would hardly have articulated the first one and not the second.

3721 *τά 2° B O 25 19' d 129 n⁻⁷⁵ t 527 68'-120'] > rell*

— *τά 3° 58-707 d n t x = Compl] > rell = Ra*

The context has three adjectival substantives *τὰ ὑφαντά καὶ τὰ ραφιδεντά καὶ τὰ ποικιλτά* as objects of *ἡρχιτεκτόνησεν*. It would be stylistically quite inept to leave one of them without an article as Ra does. Admittedly, the support is not overly widespread, but one might note that the two articles in question share a number of witnesses, *d n⁻⁷⁵ t* and 527, and if one were to adopt one as original text one would have to adopt both.

40s om *τό 4° B 15-707 f⁻²⁴⁶ 71' 392 55 426 799 = Ra*

— om *τοῦ 1° B 15-707 f⁻²⁴⁶ 71' 392 55 426 799 = Ra*

The phrase concerns *τὸ κάλυμμα τοῦ καταπέτασματος*, and concerns articulation, i.e. it is a single problem; either both or neither articles are Exod. That they are original seems quite clear from the Exod usage pattern for the genitive noun. It occurs ten times and is always articulated. In fact, *καταπέτασμα* regardless of case is

everywhere articulated except at its first occurrence (26₃₁) where it is of course indefinite. As for τὸ πέτασμα, it occurs six times, in the dative three times, and in the genitive ten times. This is not so ironclad for κάλυμμα (or κατακάλυμμα). In the plural it is articulated both times (35₁₀ 39₂₁), but in the singular it is articulated only four out of eight times (excluding 40₅). It is nonetheless clear that here the fully articulated phrase is original.

7. The Red Sea.

10₁₉ τὴν ἐρυθρὰν θάλασσαν] τὴν (> M) θαλ. τὴν ἐρυθρὰν A M O'-15-135 C" b 246 75' 85'-343' 121 68' 18 55 59 76' 646 Aeth(vid) Arab Arm Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

Though $\mathfrak{M}$ always has הַיָּם הַהוּא the pattern used by Exod is article-adjective-noun (10₁₉ 13₁₈ 15₄ 23₃₁) except at 15₂₂ where ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐρυθρᾶς occurs. The phrase also occurs in Num but there it is simply noun-adjective (14₂₅ 21₄ 33₁₀ 11). The phrase occurs three times in Deut, but there is no pattern. In 1₄₀ the Exod pattern obtains; at 2₁, that of Num, and at 11₄ it shows up as article-noun-article-adjective.

8. 34₃ αἱ A B 58-82-376-708 610 128'-407-628 55 426] > Sixt; οἱ rell

The article modifies βόες, which in the sense of "cattle" is commonly feminine, though the word can be either masculine or feminine. Oddly enough, it is always feminine in the Pentateuch in the nominative, though not in the accusative where τοὺς βόας is more common than τὰς βόας. Why this should be so is hard to see, unless it be that the word often occurs coordinate to such words as πρόβατα and κτήνη. This would mean that καί would precede. In such a case καὶ αἱ βόες with αἱ occurring immediately after καί might well be preferred to καὶ οἱ, whereas no such phenomenon would urge καὶ τὰς over against καὶ τοὺς. In any event in view of the general pattern in the Pentateuch αἱ seems to be original here.

E. Conjunctions

1. καί / δέ.

The parataxis of Hebrew has had an extremely strong influence on the LXX of the Pentateuch in general, and this is also true of Exod. According to Aejmelaeus³⁾ there are 1906 clauses which are paratactically introduced by *waw*. Of these 1373 or 72% are καί clauses in Exod, and only 312 are δέ clauses (16.4%).

In general it should be said that when there is a division in the text history the

³⁾ Anneli Aejmelaeus, Parataxis in the Septuagint: A Study of the Renderings of the Hebrew Coordinate Clauses in the Greek Pentateuch, AASF Dissertationes Humanarum Litterarum 31 (Helsinki 1982), pp. 13 and 36. Her statistics are based on Ra.

tendency towards change would probably be in the direction of greater parataxis, i.e. of *δέ* becoming *και* in the tradition because of the monotonous repetition of *καί* in the LXX text; this would easily influence the scribe unconsciously into writing a *και* construction.

The following instances are those in which Exod is in disagreement with Ra.

- 88 *ἐκάλεσεν δέ] και εκαλ.* A B 970 82 *f* x 68'-120' 130 799 Bo^A = Ra
 107 *λέγουσιν δέ] και λεγ.* B 82 *f* n 120-128' 799 = Ra
 117 *ἐν δέ] και εν* B O-15-82' *f* n 85'^{txt} x 120-128' 130 799 Latcod 101 Syh = Ra
 166 *εἶπεν δέ] και ειπεν (ειπον 72)* B O'-29 19' 129 n 120-128'-628 130 Syh = Ra
 1712 *Ἀαρὼν δέ] και ααρων* B O-82 *f* n z Cyr Ad 273 277 Latcod 104 Cyp Fortun 8 Quir II 21 Bo Syh = Ra
 3219 *ἦνίκα δέ] και ηνικα* B 15' 129 71' 55 = Ra
 3317 *εἶπεν δέ] και ειπεν* B O-15' 73'-550' 129 n 71' 121 z-68' 55 Latcodd 100 103 Syh = Ra

In 88 107 166 1712 3317 a change of subject is indicated by the *δέ* construction. It would be most unlikely that an original *και* would have been changed to *δέ* by a scribe. Change of subject is by no means usually rendered by a *δέ* construction in Exod, but it is one of the more frequent uses of the *δέ*. In each of these cases early scribes, being accustomed to writing *καί* at the beginning of clauses introduced the popular but secondary *και*.

In the other two cases, 117 and 3219, the clause involved is adversative to that which preceded. The contrast is particularly pronounced at 117. In the preceding verse the oracle predicts that there will be a great outcry throughout the land of Egypt, in fact, such an outcry as had never occurred previously and would never again take place. Verse 7 goes on to say "but among the Israelites no dog shall bark . . ."

The other instance also shows contrast. As Moses and Joshua were coming down from the mountain they heard a noise, and Joshua mistook this for the sound of battle. Moses corrects his assistant and maintains that it is rather the sound of merry-makers. Verse 19 continues: "But when they were coming near to the encampment, he saw the calf and the dancing . . ." As in the preceding instance the clause contrasts with that which preceded, and a *δέ* construction is preferable.

2. Loss of conjunction.

- 616 *καί (Καάθ)* B 15 392 Ach Aeth Sa] > rell = Ra

The conjunction has fallen out of almost the entire tradition by haplography, since the next word starts with *κα*-. If one examines the pattern of translation throughout the genealogy in which this occurs (vv. 14—25), one will note that when more than one offspring is listed for a clan father they are connected with *καί*. The only exception obtains when a list of four can be divided into two pairs (v. 14 and v. 18, though not in v. 23). From this rigid pattern as well as from the fact that *𐤀* has וקה one can only conclude that *καί* is original.

- 1613 om *δέ* 2° B F 707 131* b d-44 56* 127 t x 392 120 130 799

The *δέ* follows *τὸ πρωί* contrasting as in the preceding verse with *ἑσπέρα*. In v. 12 the *πρωί* clause is introduced by *καί*. In *℣* both clauses are introduced by *waw*, and the likelihood of the translator having suddenly used an asyndeton construction is hardly plausible. On the other hand, the omission of *δέ* in the tradition can be easily explained since its usual position is after *τό* rather than after *τὸ πρωί*. In fact, a text without *δέ* might well be misunderstood; one might understand the designation as modifying the preceding clause, viz. that (the quails) covered the encampment in the morning!

26s om *δέ* B 82^c 129 55 Aeth Arm Bo Pal Syh = Ra *℣*

The weakly supported omission of *δέ* in spite of its support by B is unlikely to be original even though it does equal *℣*; this one suspects is mere coincidence. Exod tends throughout the tabernacle account to indicate each clause syndetically regardless of *℣*, and the omission is simply due to a scribal error.

2624 om *καί* 2° B 82-376 129 127 x 392 55 Aeth = Ra

The conjunction precedes *κατά* and the variation is one of haplography/dittography, i.e. *κατά* easily promotes *και κατα* as well as the reverse. In such cases the context as well as *℣* must decide. *℣* does have the conjunction (ויחי), and the context also favours a text with *καί*. The preceding clause states with respect to the pillars that they are to be alike in the lower part. The next clause states "similarly they are to be alike from the capitals to the first juncture." A new clause is commonly marked by a conjunction, and the *καί* was likely part of the translator's work.

3535 om *καί* 1° B 15-376-767 55 Arm Syh = Ra *℣*

The shorter text is likely to be a hebraizing correction. It might be noted that it is supported by O mss Arm and Syh, though not by Arab. Furthermore one expects a *καί* here since the clause it introduces is coordinate with the preceding and parataxis is usually found in such a context, even though the Hebrew text has an asyndeton clause here.

Origen is not supposed to have omitted text in order to equal his Hebrew text, but at times one wonders whether on the rare occasion he may not have submitted to temptation. Later in the verse Exod amplifies *℣*'s *חכמת לב* by *σοφίας καὶ συνέσεως διανοίας*. The following witnesses om *καὶ συνέσεως*: A O' 118'-537 71' 121 126-128 59 426 509 Aeth Bo Syh. Again the O mss and Syh have shorter texts which equal *℣*. It is of course fully possible that these were prehexaplaric corrections based on the Hebrew.

3535 *καί* 3° B oII-29 f 130^{ms}-346^{ms}(vid) 527 318' 55 426 799 Latcod 103] > rell = *℣*

Though *καί* has no correspondence in *℣* it is nonetheless original. The construction is *καὶ τὰ ὕφαντὰ καὶ τὰ ποικιλτά*, and the introduction of the first *καί* is a matter of style. Its omission by a large segment of the tradition may well be a hebraizing correction as was suggested for the immediately preceding case.

3. The addition of a conjunction by the tradition is a much more frequent occurrence than its loss.

820 *ἰδοῦ* 970] pr και B oI-82 Cⁿ⁻²⁵ 126 b d f t 318 120'-128' 130 424 646 Arab Arm = Ra

There is a particular pattern of usage as to the use of *και* before *ἰδοῦ*. Though in 24 cases *ἰδοῦ* occurs without a *και* preceding it, 16 of these begin a direct quotation and a *και* would be unexpected. On the other hand, eight cases obtain where *καί* does occur before *ἰδοῦ*, but in two cases a *καί* is expected because clauses are logically coordinate (414 516). When the evidence in the tradition gives no clear picture it seems prudent to follow the oldest witness, in this case that of the second century ms 970.

94 οὐ B 82 125 f 127-628 x 392 799] και 552*; pr και rel = M

Asyndeton clauses are fairly uncommon in Exod when M is paratactic, but they do occur, particularly when the translator can thereby strengthen the statement to good effect. Here the lack of *και* makes the divine statement more absolute in character: οὐ τελευτήσει ἀπὸ . . . ῥητόν. The popular *και* is then a hebraizing (possibly hex) correction.

108 λατρεύσατε] pr και B 58'-82'-135 b d f n s t x y⁵²⁷ z 130 799 Aeth = Ra

Whenever לכו or לך is used to introduce another imperative in the Hebrew text of Exodus that imperative stands without the conjunction *waw* unless some other word(s) intervene(s); cf e.g. 1011 where πορεύεσθωσαν . . . και λατρεύσατε render לעבדו . . . לכו.

Exod usually follows the Hebrew practice. Three instances, however, are not clear. At 3234 βάδιζε και ὁδήγησον obtains with only 707 73'-550' 527 omitting the *καί*. The problem here is exacerbated by the intrusion of καταβηθι in B+ plures = Ra, which is, however, a secondary intrusion ex par (v.7 and 1924).

Besides 108, 1231 also presents a problem. For M's ולכו עבדו B 82'-618 b f 84 x 527 120-128' 799 Latcod 101 Aeth Arab insert *και* between the two verbs which Ra also adopts. It might be argued that by dittography Exod's parent text read ועבדו ולכו. But since the majority of witnesses lack the *και* it would be unwise to posit a different text, but rather that the longer text is secondary. This seems equally wise at 108 and the shorter text has been adopted.

115 ἕως 1°] pr και B O⁻²⁹ 135 d⁻¹²⁵ 56'-129 n 30'-85' t x 527 120-128' Latcod 101 Pal Syh = Ra
1229 ἕως 1° B 118'-537 d 121 68' 76' 509 Latcod 104 Aeth Arab Arm Co] pr και rel

In both of the above cases *καί* ἕως occurs in a coordinate phrase later in the verse where *καί* is of course necessary as a coordinating conjunction, but nowhere else in Exod does the collocation *καί* ἕως occur. The word ἕως occurs 50 times in Exod, though many of these are irrelevant. If one limits the enquiry to the pattern "from N (and) up to N" there remain 18 instances. In all but one instance (925) it involves the particle עך in M; at 925 ἕως κτήνους represents ובהמה. In all the other cases Exod has ἕως. In M, however, עך occurs 10 times (106 115 1215 18 29 1813 14 223 2331-2° 2721),

of which three (12₂₉ 18_{13 14}) are uncertain since some mss read $\gamma\epsilon\iota$. In the remaining seven instances (9₁₈ 11₇ 12₁₂ 13_{2 15} 23_{31-1°} 28₄₂) $\mathfrak{M}$ reads $\gamma\epsilon\iota$. It is clear that Exod disregarded the distinction between $\gamma\epsilon$ and $\gamma\epsilon\iota$ using a coordinating conjunction only when two phrases occurred coordinately.

1246 οὐκ] pr και B oI-82' C'' f 75' 84 x 318-527 130 Latcod 104 Aeth Arab Arm = Ra

The και is probably secondary. It is not present in $\mathfrak{M}$ and was introduced because of the popular gloss και ου καταλειψετε απο των κρεων εις το πρωι from Lev 22₃₀ which was added between βρωθήσεται and οὐκ ἐξοίσετε. Once a clause obtained with a second plural verb the following clause with such a verb would almost automatically be introduced by και. In the original LXX this situation did not obtain, and no good reason for adding the conjunction over against the Hebrew existed.

1428 οὐ] pr και B O-426-15' 19' f-56° 527 120-628-630 508 Latcod 111 Arab Arm Bo = Ra

There is no conjunction in $\mathfrak{M}$, and since $\mathfrak{M}$ is usually highly paratactic as well as its Greek translation, it was easy for scribes to add και to the beginning of a clause even where it did not occur; the και is likely to be secondary. It should be noted that most of the O witnesses have the variant in spite of $\mathfrak{M}$, which probably means that Origen's text, i.e., a third century witness, had it. The more unusual asyndetic text is here to be preferred.

1812 Ἀαρών] pr moses et Arm; pr και A F M O'-426-15-707 C''-52' 77 126 761 b 107'-125 53' 5-730 t y 18 46 59 76' 509 646 Syh

$\mathfrak{M}$ does not have the conjunction. There would be no difficulty here were it not for the fact that δέ occurs immediately before it. The question is who added the και; was it Exod or a later scribe? Its only purpose is to call attention in a balanced καί . . . καί construction to the fact that both Aaron and all the elders joined in a common meal with Moses' father-in-law. There seems little basis for choosing the critical text beyond depending on the oldest witness.

1916 ἐγίνοντο] pr και B O'-29 426 56c-129-246 392 z 799 Pal = $\mathfrak{M}$

The clause beginning with ἐγίνοντο is preceded by an ἐγένετο clause indicating time when by a specific reference to a day. Whenever such an ἐγένετο "time when" clause precedes, no και is used to introduce the following clause except at 16₁₃ ἐγένετο δὲ ἐσπέρα καὶ ἀνέβη. There, however, the time indication is expressed by the subject.

Other instances in Exod are

211 ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταῖς πολλαῖς . . . ἐξῆλθεν

1241 ἐγένετο μετὰ τετρακόσια τριάκοντα ἔτη ἐξῆλθεν

1251 ἐγένετο ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ (+ και 707 75) ἐξήγαγεν

1622 ἐγένετο δὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑκτῇ (+ και n-127 799) συνέλεξαν

1627 ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ (+ και 707) ἐξῆλθον

1813 ἐγένετο μετὰ τὴν ἐπαύριον συνεκάθισεν

3230 (ἐγένετο μετὰ τὴν αὐριον) εἶπεν B 15'-767 73'-550' b 125 53'-129 n 71' z 55 424 Arm Co] pr και rell

4015 ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ μηνὶ τῷ πρώτῳ . . . ἐστάθη ἡ σκηνή

Of this list only 3230 is problematic in the tradition in view of the strong support for the *και* in the tradition, but this is probably due to hex correction since $\mathfrak{M}$ has אִי־אָרִי .

Oddly enough when the passive form of *γίνομαι* is used to introduce time when, a *και* always follows the clause to join it to the next. Thus

1013 τὸ πρῶτὸ ἐγενήθη καὶ (> 72 246 458) ὁ ἄνεμος ὁ νότος ἀνέλαβεν

1229 ἐγενήθη δὲ μεσοῦσης τῆς νυκτὸς καὶ κύριος ἐπάταξεν

1424 ἐγενήθη δὲ ἐν τῇ φυλακῇ τῇ ἐωθινῇ καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν

253 ἀργύριον] pr *και* A B O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15' 129 x 128'-407-628 426 646 Arab Arm Bo Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$ Tar

— χαλκόν] pr (*Syh) *και* B 15-72-376 ^{Lat}cod 102 Aeth^{MPR} Arab Arm Bo Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

254 ὑάκινθον] pr (*Syh) *και* A B F M O⁻⁶⁴767-15' 44-107' s t x 392 128'-407-628 18 46 55 59 76' 426 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$ Tar

— πορφύραν] pr (*Syh) *και* A B 15-72-376 118'-537 s 59 Arm Bo Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

— κόκκινον] pr *και* A B 15'-72-376 118'-537 s 128'-407-628 55 76' 426 646 Arm Bo Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

Ra has adopted all the *και*s in 2534. Since the second, third and fourth are all under the asterisk for all of which the source is given in Syh, it is most unlikely that any of these are Exod. They certainly were not in the text used by Origen. The first and last ones have also been adjudged secondary, not because they are asterisked (because they are not) but because the pattern of support is quite similar to the others. They also might well be hex — note the pattern of support in the O mss as well as by Arm and Syh.

If one examines the many instances in chh. 25—31 and 35—40 of these lists of materials, only two of the lists are largely asyndetic, this one in 2534 and the one in 3536. What they have in common is that both are simply lists of materials which are to be or were taken in gross in introducing the matter of the building of the tabernacle and its furnishings. Once they are introduced and are then referred to as the materials for a specific task, they are invariably syndetic throughout. The pattern is thus quite clear; the *και* is hex throughout. This is also true at 3536. The evidence is as follows:

v. 5 ἀργύριον] pr (*Syh^T) *και* O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth Arab Bo Syh

— χαλκόν] pr et Aeth Arab Bo

v. 6 ὑάκινθον] pr (*Arm^{mss} Syh) *και* 72-376 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh

— πορφύραν] pr (*Arm^{mss} Syh) *και* O⁻⁵⁸ Aeth^P Arab Arm Bo Syh

— κόκκινον] pr *και* O⁻⁵⁸ b 56' 392 68'-120' 799 Arab Arm Bo Syh

3034 ὄνυχα] pr (*Syh^L) *και* M O⁻⁷⁶⁷-29-707^I C^{''}(-761) d f⁻¹²⁹ s t 392 z 18 46 319 424 509 646' Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ Sam Tar^O

— χαλβάνην B 15'-707 527 55] pr *και* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The two nouns occur in a list: *στακτὴν ὄνυχα χαλβάνην ἡδυσμοῦ καὶ λίβανον διαφανῇ*. $\mathfrak{M}$ connects the first three with conjunctions. The translator avoids the parataxis and joins only the last pair by *καί* thereby following good Greek usage. The majority additions of *και* are revisional, possibly, though by no means necessarily, hex.

3230 εἶπεν B 15'-767 73'-550' b 125 53'-129 n 71' z 55 424 Arm Co] pr *και* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

Ⲙ has ויאמר, but the clause is preceded by a temporal clause in ויהי. When the timer is itself a clause such as כי or כאשר clauses, or is a preposition with a bound infinitive, the introductory ויהי is not rendered at all. When the timer is a prepositional phrase as at 32³⁰ (ממחרת) the ויהי is translated (except at 223). If the next clause begins with a verb in the perfect without a conjunction, Exod naturally does not add a και (1241 51 1622 27), but if that clause begins with a *waw* and a preterite verb, Exod wavers between a Hebraic rendering of the conjunction with a και (628f 1229 1424 1613 1916) or a more idiomatic past tense verb without a και (211 424 1813 4015). At 32³⁰ the και of the popular text in the tradition is probably secondary, it having been added by hex. It is of course fully possible that an original και might be omitted in the tradition in the interests of good style, but here this seems not to be the case. In any event, the major witnesses to the hex text have the και and it seems reasonable to interpret the και as recensional.

3321 στήση B 15' 129 55 Sa] pr και rell = Ⲙ

The original clause must have been an asyndeton one. The preceding clause is a nominal ἰδού τόπος παρ' ἐμοί, and this clause says "you will stand on the rock." Had the original text had a conjunction it is almost inconceivable that the tradition would have dropped it in favour of so harsh an asyndeton construction. The text with και is much smoother; it is also supported by Ⲙ, and the lectio difficilior is clearly to be preferred here.

3429 Μωνσῆς 2° 15-58-707 120' 55 426 Arm Sa] μωσῆς B; > 376; και 125 126; pr και rell = Ⲙ

That the addition of και is hex seems clear. It was almost certainly sub asterisk in Origen as might be inferred from the fact that ms 58 does not support the variant whereas other members of O (except for 376 which has omitted και μωσῆς by error), i.e. 72-767 Syh, all support it. Since ms 58 often omits both passages under the asterisk and those under the obelus indiscriminately, it would appear that its support for Exod is accidental.

Exod has taken καταβαίνοντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ἐκ τοῦ ὄρους as syntactically part of the following clause, rather than of the preceding as the accentuation in Ⲙ presupposes. Accordingly Exod in agreement with his usual practice did not render the conjunction of וַיֵּרָד.

1220 ἐν παντί] + δε B 58-82 x 392 120-128' 130 = Ra

The particle δε correctly emphasizes the contrast between what you may not eat and what you may eat. If the particle is not there, one would almost certainly understand the verse in the same way. The particle is hardly original, however; i.e. it is a scribal plus. It should be noted that the variant has the particle after παντί, not after ἐν which would be the usual position. In fact, of the many instances of δέ in Exod only three times does it occur after the second word of the clause rather than after the first (in 221 ἐν γαστρὶ δὲ λαβοῦσα admittedly an exact parallel to 1220; in 1613 after τὸ πρῶν, and in 171 οὐκ ἦν δέ). Otherwise δέ always occurs after the first word, even

if it is an unaccented word such as the articles, the preposition *ἐν* (823), or *ὡς* (1317 3429). One possible instance calling for comment obtains at 2829: *τὸ δὲ αὐτό (εἶδος)] το αὐτο δε* 82 *b* 55 = Ra; om *δέ* B Bo^A. Why Ra should have read as he did is incomprehensible. Surely this must be an unintentional error.

218 *ἐάν]* + *δε* A F^a 29'-376-oI C'' *b* d-44 n-458 t x 527 128'-628 59 76' 424 426 509 646' Aeth Co

Usually in Exod *ἐάν* is followed by *δέ* (61 times) or is accompanied by some other conjunctive particle (*ἐάν οὖν* 41 2227; *ἐάν τε* 1913 twice; *καὶ ἐάν* 79). Twice *καὶ ἔσται* precedes it and so no *δε* could follow. There remains a number of protases, however, where no *δε* follows. In each case *℣* also has no conjunction. These are at 1823 212 8 19 227 2414 and 3012. In some of these the tradition has added a *δε*, but it is clear that the translator did not automatically (as e.g. the Num translator) write *εάν δε* in introducing conditional clauses, and in these cases one must rely solely on the tradition. The evidence for the shorter text is substantial; it includes inter alia B F and M, and in view of the oft repeated *εάν δε*, the accretion can easily be understood as being ex par. The reverse would be more difficult to explain.

4. Change of conjunction.

1244 *ἦ* B f 392] *καὶ* rell

1245 *ἦ* B M^{ms} 82 56-129 x 392 120 130 Sa] *καὶ* rell = *℣*

These two cases should be considered together. In the first case, neither *ἦ* nor the variant *καὶ* is supported by *℣*, but *ἦ* seems original since *οἰκέτην τινὸς ἢ ἀργυρώνητον* is referred to by *αὐτόν* rather than *αὐτοὺς*. In *℣* the servant is identified as one bought by money, and the singular reference is of course obvious. In v. 45 *℣* has יאכל תושב ושכיר לא יאכל which Exod "fixed up" by rendering the conjunction by *ἦ*, thereby making the singular verb fit the context. This is typical of the translator who often smoothed out the difficulties of the Hebrew. The reinterpretation of v. 44 by which the *οἰκέτην* and the *ἀργυρώνητον* are made to be two individuals may well be due to v. 45. The variant text in v. 45 may then be a correction based on the Hebrew, which text in turn influenced v. 44.

225 *ἦ* 2°] *καὶ* B O-767-15 z 424 426 799 Arm Syh = Ra

The variant text adopted by Ra is a hebraizing correction since *℣* has *waw*. It may be hex; in any event most of the O witnesses attest to the reading. Exod chose the contextually more appropriate correlative, since already in the protasis it was used to join *ἀγρόν* and *ἀμπελῶνα* rather than *καὶ*. It should be noted, however, that *ἦ* 1° represents an *או* in *℣*.

F. Word order.

1. Many instances of change in word order in the traditions are clearly the result of hex activity.

23 *αὐτό*] post *κρύπτειν* tr A F M 29'-135-376'-oI C" 19' d s-30' t 121' 18 59 76' 130 509 646 = $\mathfrak{M}$
 — *ἔλαβεν*] pr * *ει* Syh; + *αὐτω* (*αυτο* 72 318 122*; *εαυτο* 799) B F O-426-15' b d 56'-129 370 x y-121 68'-120' 55 59 130 799 Latcod 100 Ach Sa = Ra

$\mathfrak{M}$ has עור הצפינו ותקן לו. The popular order *ετι κρυπτειν αυτο* is almost certainly hex. The evidence of Syh needs explanation. It has *lh* which probably represents *αὐτω*; in other words, it has omitted *αὐτό* by error and has *αὐτω* under the asterisk but has it before rather than after *ἔλαβεν*. The *αὐτω* reading is then to be taken as hex as well and is not original Exod as Ra would have it. It should be noted that most of the O mss support the *αὐτω*.

210 *αὐτὸν ἀνελόμην*] tr A F^b M 64-376-oII-82' C"-52 57* 78 126 761 d-610 56 75 730 t-46 x y-392 55 76' Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

The popular variant is probably hex in origin. When there is variation in word order in the tradition, the order that agrees with $\mathfrak{M}$ is probably secondary (at least if there is more than casual support for the non $\mathfrak{M}$ order). The nature of Origen's work was such that perforce he changed the order of words to fit the order of the Hebrew in columns one and two of the hexapla. In this case this would not have been determinative, however, since $\mathfrak{M}$ has משיטהו, i.e. a single word.

211 *ἐαυτοῦ ἀδελφῶν*] *ἀδελφῶν αὐτου* A F M 29'-135-376-oI-618 C" d 129-246 127-321-343' t 71 y 18 59 76' 509 646 verss = $\mathfrak{M}$

$\mathfrak{M}$ has מאחי, and Exod adds *τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*, emphasizing the relationship between Moses and the Israelites: they are his very own brothers. It is obvious that Exod particularly emphasizes this not only by the identifying gloss, but also by the use of the reflexive pronoun. The reading of B+ is undoubtedly Exod.

1319 *ὑμᾶς κύριος*] tr A F M 29-58'-64'-135 C"-422 19' d t y-318 68' 18 46 59 76' 130 424 509 799 Sa Syh = Tar

The popular order is probably hex. Exod normally has the accusative pronominal modifier immediately after the verb and the named subject after it, such as *ἐκάλεσεν αὐτοῦς Μωυσῆς* (3431). In fact the reverse order: verb-subject-accusative personal pronoun occurs only once in Exod (521 *ἴδοι ὁ θεὸς ὑμᾶς*), whereas the usual order is attested 29 times. This pattern is of course promoted by the fact that such pronominal modifiers are commonly suffixed to the Hebrew verb and thus automatically precede the named subject.

1619 *εἰς τὸ πρῶν* | *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ*] tr B O'-29 126 b d-610 f n 30' t x 318-527 120-128'-628 55 130 319 799 Latcod 102 Arab Arm Co Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

1620 *Μωυσῆς* | *ἐπ' αὐτοῖς*] tr B 82'-426 f n 30' x 318' 120-128'-628 130 799 Latcodd 102 104 Arm Co = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

As a general rule a word order well supported in the tradition at variance with that of the Hebrew is probably to be preferred, since Origen perforce "corrected" the word order to conform to that of his first two columns. That the B reading in v. 19 is such a corrected hex reading is made the more likely by its support by all the major hex witnesses. The reading in v. 20 is not as certain as that of v. 19 since the

major O witnesses are divided. Nevertheless the order contrary to $\mathfrak{M}$ is probably Exod.

186 *Ἰοθόρ / ὁ γαμβρός σου*] tr B 15'-376'-707 118'-537 *f* 120'-128-628 Arm Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

The word order of the variant text is almost certainly hex. Note particularly the support of the chief O witnesses, 376 and 426, as well as of Arm and Syh. If B had not supported this order, no one would have thought of this order as anything but recensional. B is here, as occasionally elsewhere, influenced by hex.

1823 *ἐαυτοῦ τόπον*] *τοπον αυτου* A F M 29-376 C-73-413-551 *b d s*^{-30'} *t x y*⁻³⁹² 18 46 55 59 76'; tr 15-426-oI *cl*^{-73 413 551} 646

Although some O witnesses do support Exod the popular placement of the genitive pronoun after the noun is almost certain to be a correction based on the Hebrew and probably hex in origin.

1918 *τὸν θεόν / ἐπ' αὐτό*] tr B O⁻³⁷⁶-15 129 Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$ Tar

The transposition is clearly based on the hex revision which corrected word order to conform to $\mathfrak{M}$ and not original as Ra. Here too the text of B shows hex influence.

213 *καὶ ἡ γυνή / ἐξελεύσεται*] tr B O⁻²⁹ (72) 129 *n* 527 *z*^{-68'} Arab Arm Co Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

The variant word order is a corrected order probably hex in origin, and not original as in Ra. The translator used balanced constructions throughout this verse. In the first part "he alone should enter" is balanced by "alone he shall go out." So too in the second half: "but if a wife came in with him" has its counterpart in "also the wife shall go out with him."

2210 *πρόβατον ἢ μόσχον*] *μοσχον η προβατον* B F^b O⁻²⁹ *b* 129 *n* 30' *x* 527 *z* 424 426 646 Arm Sa Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

Why Ra should have adopted as text what is obviously a hex correction of word order is puzzling; note the support of O Arm Syh as well as 426, all good hex witnesses. It is quite different later in the verse where only B 82 *fz* 424 799 Arm Sa support *συντριβὴ ἢ τελευτήσῃ* with all other witnesses changing the word order to conform to $\mathfrak{M}$. There B witnesses to the original (i.e. non $\mathfrak{M}$) word order.

2510 *ἔξωθεν καὶ ἔσωθεν* B 413-414*-761* 129 Cyr VIII 1381 ^{Lat}ConcilCyr I 5 ConcilTol 15 Syh] om *ἔξωθεν καί* 458; *εσωθεν και εξωθεν* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The popular correction is hex. One might suggest that the sparse and scattered support is to be discounted, since the two adverbs are distinguished by only one letter, and that it is simply scribal error. On the other hand, when an early uncial has a word order different from $\mathfrak{M}$, and the "correct" order is found supported in the tradition, it is likely that the word order agreeing with $\mathfrak{M}$ was the result of Origen's re-ordering of the Greek words to fit the Hebrew order. Accordingly the text of B+ has been accepted here as original text.

347 οὐ καθαρῶν | τὸν ἔνοχον B 15' f⁻¹²⁹ 30' 318' 55 426 799 Co] pr καθαρῶν M^{ms}
58-707-767 n 527 Latcodd 91 94—96 103; non emundans eum Latcod 100; tr rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The translator with fine feeling placed the accusative modifier after the verb, thereby continuing the majority pattern of the context, “doing mercy, forgiving sins, visiting iniquities.” The transposed order of the majority of witnesses is probably a hex reordering to fit the order of $\mathfrak{M}$.

2. Also hexaplaric but not as obviously so are a number of instances.

627 Ἀαρὼν A B 82' b n 30' x 392 z 130 799 Latcod 100 Ach Sa] et Μωυσῆς tr rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

In the preceding verse the order Ἀαρὼν καὶ Μωυσῆς obtains in all witnesses and equals $\mathfrak{M}$. The common order is, of course, Moses and Aaron, which the majority text and $\mathfrak{M}$ follow in v. 27. The unusual order is probably to be preferred, since the translator often tries to rid the narrative of small inconsistencies. It is also possible that the unusual order was already present in the parent text and that $\mathfrak{M}$ is itself the result of the leveling process. The majority reading in Greek is probably due to hex.

111 ἐκβαλεῖ ὑμᾶς | ἐκβολῇ] tr A M O⁻⁷²⁻²⁹ Cⁿ b d t 121 68' 18 55 76' Latcod 101 Aeth Syh
= $\mathfrak{M}$

Since the passage is preceded by σὺν παντί, the translator did not want to have ἐκβολῇ as another dative singular immediately follow παντί (although παντί is not feminine), since it might be misunderstood. The popular reading is then a correction (possibly hex) to the Hebrew order. Furthermore, the Exod order is the unusual order for rendering free cognate infinitives plus inflected verb, and as the lectio difficilior should be seriously considered as original text.

2013—15 οὐ μοιχεύσεις οὐ κλέψεις | οὐ φονεύσεις B 82 f 120' Sa] ου κλεψεις ου φονευσεις ου μοιχ. 799; ου μοιχευσεις ου φονευσεις ου κλεψεις C^{-422 125} n⁻¹²⁷ 30' x Luc 1820 Rom 139: ex Deut 517—19; tr Matth 1918 Marc 1019 rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

Though the order of B+ adopted here as Exod has very little ms support, it is nonetheless probably original. Except for 799, a wayward and idiosyncratic text, the variant orders are easily explicable. The C+ reading is to be found in the Deut version of the commandments, and the popular order is that of $\mathfrak{M}$ and undoubtedly adopted by Origen. The B+ text cannot easily be explained as the product of textual revision, and so must be original. Was it due to an understanding of these commandments being ordered in an ascending order of criminality?

2532 (ἐν) τῷ ἐνί | καλαμίσκῳ B F^a(vid) 82' b f n x y⁻³¹⁸ 120' 55 799 Latcodd 100 102 103] om ἐνί 767; tr rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

That the popular reading is revisionary (probably hex) is quite clear. $\mathfrak{M}$ has בקנה תאכה. If the $\mathfrak{M}$ order had been followed, the translator would have written ἐν τῷ καλαμίσκῳ τῷ ἐνί; that is the dominant usage pattern of Exod, though with a cardinal number as modifier of the noun the pattern article-cardinal number-noun does oc-

cur fairly often as well. The fact that the result of adapting the word order to the Hebrew left a pattern noun-article-modifier which is uncharacteristic of Exod shows its secondary nature.

291 ἀμώμους δύο] tr B O-82' b 129 n 30' 71' 55 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm Syh = Ra **℣**

The change in word order shown by the B+ text is secondary, probably due to Origen as the support by O mss Arm Syh shows. It might be noted that the Exod text here — *κριοὺς ἀμώμους δύο* — parallels the word order of the coordinate phrase immediately before it, *μοσχάριον ἐκ βοῶν ἔν*, with the number coming at the end. Here too O mss Arm Syh have corrected to the word order found in **℣**. Mss O-³⁷⁶ and Arm Syh read *μοσχαριον εν εκ βοων*.

2918 τὸν κριόν / ὄλον] tr B O-82' b 129 n 30' 71' 55 426 Arm Syh = Ra **℣**

The change in word order is almost certainly hex as the support which is nearly identical with that found in the preceding case (v. 1) shows. It is hard to imagine a scribe changing an original *ολον τον κριον* to *τον κριον ολον* since the former order is so dominant in the Greek O.T.

3113 ἔστιν γάρ σημειόν] *οτι σημειον εστι(ν)* O-⁷⁶⁷⁻⁷⁰⁷1 Syh = **℣**; *σημειον εστι(ν)* B = Ra; *om γάρ* 15 55 426

℣ has *הוא כִּי אֵת*, to which the O reading corresponds exactly. The change in word order is clearly the work of Origen, and the omission of *γάρ* in favour of a preposed *οτι* is also his work: presumably an exact word for word equivalency could only be gotten by the latter change since *γάρ* must be placed postpositively. The reading of B shows the hex word order but with the omission of *γάρ / οτι*, and is certainly not to be chosen with Ra as critical text.

352 ἔργον / ἐν αὐτῇ B M'™ 58'-376-707-767 b n 527 68' 18 46 426 Arm Bo] *εργα εν αυτη* 30' 799; *εργον εν αυτω* M'™s 15-72 392*; tr 836 rell = **℣**

The pattern of support is puzzling in that all the O mss support the non **℣** order of Exod even though the majority text follows the word order of **℣**. Both Arab and Syh, however, follow the Hebrew word order. It would seem that the O mss are here non-hexaplaric in their reading.

3535 πάντα / συνιέναι ποιῆσαι] tr A F M' 29'-58-376-oI C⁷⁰⁰-500 b d n s t x 121' 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 426 509 verss

℣ has *לעשות כל מלאכת* and the variant order is probably a hex correction to make the text formally correspond to **℣**. The word *συνιέναι* is rightly under the obelus in Syh (cod τ erroneously has ✕), since it has no equivalent in **℣**. The word is omitted by 58-707 n 426 ^{Lat}codd 100 103 Arab, possibly a posthexaplaric correction.

Note also that **℣** has *חַרֵּשׁ* as the next word, whereas Exod has *τοῦ ἁγίου*. Apparently the translator misread the word as *קֶדֶשׁ*.

3918 (πάντα) αὐτῆς / τὰ σκεύη] *τα αυτης σκευη* B 53'-56 75' 130-321 509 799 = Ra; tr O-707 73 129-246 527 z ^{Lat}codd 100 103 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh = **℣**

That placing *αὐτῆς* at the end of the phrase is based on a hex correction is obvious. Whether the pronoun originally stood between *πάντα* and *τά* or between *τά* and *σκεύη* is difficult to decide. The former has been chosen for two reasons a) a stylistic dislike for placing *τά* immediately after *πάντα*, i. e. it is clearer to a reader to have *αὐτῆς* intervene, and hopefully the translator was sensitive to such, since he would have written without word division and accents, and b) the very strong support it enjoys. Neither reason is compelling but together they do make *αὐτῆς τὰ σκεύη* the more likely as Exod text.

3. A number of problems in word order involve pronouns.

312 *ἐξαγαγεῖν σε*] tr A F M 29'-135-οI C''-78 129 s-127 γ 18 55 76' 509

There seems to be no particular pattern of word order in the matter of infinitive plus a pronominal subject. The pronoun precedes in *ἡμᾶς δουλεύειν* 1412; *αὐτὸν πεπονηρεῦσθαι* 2211, and *σε εἶναι* 333, but follows at 1026 *ἐλθεῖν ἡμᾶς*; 291 *ἱερατεύειν μοι αὐτούς*; 2936 *ἀγιάζειν σε*; 338 *εἰσελθεῖν αὐτόν*, and 3429 *λαλεῖν αὐτόν*. The pronoun following the infinitive does occur more frequently than that preceding it, possibly because in Hebrew the pronoun is suffixed to the infinitive. Since the oldest witness, Codex B, has *ἐξαγαγεῖν σε*, it seemed prudent to choose it as critical text.

68 *ὕμιν αὐτήν*] tr A M O''-58 135 cII-52* 54 422 b d-125 f 628 85 t-84 x γ-318 18 55 59 509 Latcod 100 Arab Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

Whenever an accusative third person pronoun and a first or second person dative pronoun occur after a verbal form, Exod has the order: dative-accusative regardless of the Hebrew. The following obtain: 29 *θῆλασόν μοι αὐτό*; 68 *δώσω ὑμῖν αὐτήν*; 1311 *δῶ σοι αὐτήν*; 2230 *ἀποδώσεις μοι αὐτό*; 291 *ἱερατεύειν μοι αὐτούς*.

Whenever both pronouns are third person the order is the reverse, i. e. accusative-dative. This occurs only three times: 2216 *φερνιεῖ αὐτήν αὐτῷ*; 2217 *δοῦναι αὐτήν αὐτῷ*, and 3429 *ἐν τῷ λαλεῖν αὐτόν αὐτῷ*.

716 *μοι λατρεύσωσιν* 707 b 129 n 30' 392-527 z] *μοι λατρευση* (-σει 619) A B 835 58-82 84 x 59 130 Latcod 100; om *μοι* 318; tr rell

Comparable constructions, all following "send away (my) people," are found at 423 51 81 8 20 91 13 103. Of these only 423 has the singular verb (in fact it has exactly the same reading as the A B reading at 716), and all the others have the plural. Actually Exod in each case followed the number of $\mathfrak{M}$; i. e. only 423 has a singular verb in $\mathfrak{M}$. Since $\mathfrak{M}$ has the plural at 716, it is reasonable to suggest that the plural is original and the singular may well be due to the influence of 423.

The original word order is a more difficult matter to determine. $\mathfrak{M}$ shows the first person singular pronoun by means of a suffix throughout. In the above list all but 88 have *μοι*, but only two (913 103) have *μοι* after the verb, all the others preposing the verb with *μοι* which seems preferable here as well, the presupposition being that the post verbal pattern would be a (hex?) correction.

720 αὐτοῖς κύριος] tr F 29-58-82-135-426-οΙ Cⁿ-16 126 422 500 246 s⁻³²¹ t 318 59 76' 509 646
Sa(vid) Syh

When ἐντείλατο is modified by a dative pronoun and has an expressed subject, the pronoun precedes the subject (76 10 20 34₃₄ 40₁₄); whenever the indirect object is a noun, however, the subject precedes (128 50). Or the generalization can be made in this way: whenever the verb ἐντέλλομαι is modified by a dative pronoun in Exod, it follows the verb immediately.

1214 (ἡ ἡμέρα) αὕτη ὑμῖν] tr B = Ra

I suspect this to be an error in B, perpetuated by Sixt, and adopted by Ra. The lemma = $\mathfrak{M}$ and it probably is original. Admittedly, the main reason for suspecting the B reading is that it has no support in the tradition, and unique readings are usually scribal errors.

189 αὐτοῖς κύριος B 82 b 56'-129 n⁻⁷⁵ 30' 392 120'-128-628 799 Latcod 104 Bo] om κύριος 75;
tr rell: cf $\mathfrak{M}$

When a verb is followed both by a noun as subject as well as a dative pronoun the usual order in Exod is verb-dative pronoun-subject noun. Out of 48 instances of these patterns only the following instances invert the order to verb-subject noun-pronoun.

1213 (ἔσται) τὸ αἶμα / ὑμῖν] tr 414' Arm Bo

1225 (δφ) κύριος ὑμῖν] tr 376 Arm

138 (ἐποίησεν) κύριος ὁ θεός / μοι] μοι $\overline{\kappa\zeta}$ ο $\overline{\theta\zeta}$ μου 707 d 246 n s⁻³⁴⁴ t⁻⁴⁶ 130; tr
Arm

2633 (διοριεῖ) τὸ καταπέτασμα / ὑμῖν] tr LatAug Ex 112 Arm Bo

At 189 the Exod order has a minority of witnesses but the text is assured. It is the usual order for Exod and the majority order is probably a hex correction.

3228 (ἐν) τῇ ἡμέρᾳ / ἐκείνῃ] tr B 15'-707-767 73'-550' n 30' 527 z 426 Latcodd 100 103 104 =
Ra

When the demonstrative pronoun is used attributively in Exod it always follows the noun it modifies, or if the noun is also modified by an adjective it comes at the end as in τὰς ἡμέρας τὰς πολλὰς ἐκείνας in 223 418. For ἐκεῖνος this occurs 18 times in Exod, and 66 times for οὗτος and not once does the pattern article-pronoun-noun or preposition-pronoun-articulated noun obtain. It is thus clear that ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in the tradition is secondary.

3315 αὐτὸς σύ B 58'-οΙΙ-29 129 407 55* 426 Phil II 301 Bas II 437 Cyr IX 729] om αὐτός 25
Latcod 103 Co Syh; om σύ 376 73'-550 527 55c Ath II 560 Cyr VI 648 GregNys II 277 Or
X 253 LatPsAug Hypomn 3; tr rell

The Hebrew is no great help here since it has פניך as the subject of a nominal sentence with the predicate as הלכים; this Exod rendered by πορεύη. That this word order is original is proven by the tradition concerning πορεύη (the popular transposition is simply a "correction" to the more usual Greek order): πορεύη B 15' 129 407 Syh] πορεύει 458 55*; προπορ. C'-57 646; συμπορευση A 72 b 44 53' 74-76 x 18; ex-

as PsAug *Hypomn* 3; συμπορευη (cvar) rel. The popular συμπορ. is easily explicable, if the original order αὐτὸς σύ rather than the transposed order preceded it. Furthermore, the compound makes excellent sense, i.e. God is addressed by Moses: “unless you yourself go along,” to which in turn the tradition also added μεθ ἡμῶν. All but B 15-72-767 129 127 55 Phil III 301 Cyr IX 729 add μεθ ἡμῶν (except as μετ ἐμου in 707 Cyr III 1388 VI 648 Or X 253 ^{La}cod 103 and as ἡμιν in 426 GregNys II 277), which simplified the secondary συμπορευη by reading “unless you yourself go along with us.” The full development into the majority text in the tradition became εἰ μὴ συ αὐτοῦ συμπορευη μεθ ἡμῶν from an original εἰ μὴ αὐτὸς σύ πορεύῃ. This text undoubtedly was also influenced by v. 16 where συμπορευομένου σου μεθ’ ἡμῶν occurs.

4. There are a number of disparate cases involving word order.

32 (ἐν πυρὶ φλογός] (cvar) φλογι πυρός A F O’-29’-135 C” 108^(ms) d n 30’ t y 128’ 59 130 424 509 Act 7₃₀ ^{La}cod 100 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh = Ra

℣ has בִּלְבַת אַשׁ and the variant text is a hebraizing correction, probably hex in origin. Over against the NT evidence of Act 7₃₀ (Wa 322f forcibly challenges the correctness of this text in view of the divided evidence) stands the certain evidence of Thess II 1₈ supporting the Exod text. For a full discussion of πυρὶ φλογός as original text cf the detailed discussion in Wa 322—324.

38 Εὐαίων] et Γεργεσαίων tr B 72 Aeth^C = Ra

The names occur in the list of seven nations; in the Hebrew the Girgashites are not present so that its original position in the list is uncertain. Since the order of B which places it in fifth position is only supported by but one other Greek ms, its order has been rejected in favour of the almost universally supported order, i.e. in sixth place. The name occurs in Exod in the list of seven in five other instances; in each case ℣ omits the Girgashites. In 23₂₃ it stands as number five; in 31₇ and 34₁₁ it also stands in sixth place; in 13₅ and 33₂ it is in fourth place.

317 καὶ Εὐαίων] post Γεργεσαίων tr A B 15’-426 129 x z Carl 49 Arm Syh = Ra; post Φερεζαίων tr 58’-707 628 30’; post Ἰεβουσαίων tr 376

℣ does not have a text representing καὶ Γεργεσαίων; it has וְהַחִי in the καὶ Γεργεσαίων slot. ℣ has the order: Canaanite, Hittite, Amorite, Pherezite, Hivite, Jebusite. It is clear that Origen had to change the position of καὶ Εὐαίων. It should be noted that the O evidence is divided; 426 Arm and Syh place the phrase after Girgashite, 58’, after Pherezite, and 376 (wrongly), after Jebusite. It is thus apparent that the A B+ reading is a hex correction, whereas the popular order with the Hivites in third place is the original order.

67 ἐμαντῶ — ἐμοί] υμᾶς εἰς λαὸν ἐμαντῶ 29 d⁽⁻⁴⁴⁾ t 509; υμᾶς λαὸν ἐμαντῶ f; υμᾶς ἐμαντῶ (> 314*; + εἰς (sub ✕ Arm^{ms} Syh) F^a M 15-58-135-376 19’ s x 527 18 646 Bo) λαὸν ἐμοι (om

λ. εμ. F oI C" 121-392 59 76' Aeth; εμον 318; > F^a M O⁽⁻⁷²⁾-15-135-707 s 527 18 55 646 Arab Arm Syh) A F M O^{"-29 (72) 82} C" b n s x y 128' 18 55 59 76' 646 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh

Only the reading of Exod could be the original text and the various variant texts are all attempts to fix up the text. $\mathfrak{M}$ has $\text{אֶתְּכֶם לִי לְעֹמֶד}$, and Exod has gratuitously added $\epsilon\mu\alpha\nu\tau\tilde{\omega}$ at the beginning. This was done to modify the verb $\lambda\eta\mu\psi\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$, i.e. God says: "I will take for myself." Then עֹמֶד לִי was freely rendered by $\lambda\alpha\delta\acute{o}\nu \epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$. This meant that $\epsilon\mu\alpha\nu\tau\tilde{\omega}$ and $\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$ made for a repetitious text, and some variants eliminated $\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota$ entirely. The problem was exacerbated by the popular reading which transposed $\epsilon\mu\alpha\nu\tau\tilde{\omega} \upsilon\mu\tilde{\alpha}\varsigma$; i.e. this made the presence of the two words for "to me" more severe. Still a further "fixing up" of the text is seen in the hex addition of $\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ before $\lambda\alpha\omicron\nu$ to equal $\epsilon\mu\lambda$. Only the text of Exod could have produced so complex a tradition history.

77 $\eta\tilde{\nu} \epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ / $\acute{o}\gamma\delta\omicron\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha \tau\tilde{\rho}\iota\omega\nu$ F 72 125 f⁻¹²⁹ n 619 318-527 59 130 799 Latcod 100] om $\eta\tilde{\nu}$ B 126 107' = Ra; $\omicron\gamma\delta$. $\tau\tilde{\rho}$. $\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 77 68'; $\omicron\gamma\delta$. $\tau\tilde{\rho}$. $\eta\nu$ 30; $\omicron\gamma\delta$. $\tau\tilde{\rho}$. $\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ $\eta\nu$ A 29' b 44 s⁻³⁰ 121-392 55 509; $\eta\nu$ $\omicron\gamma\delta$. $\tau\tilde{\rho}$. $\epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 76'; $\omicron\gamma\delta$. $\kappa\alpha\iota \tau\tilde{\rho}$. $\eta\nu \epsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 15-58; om $\eta\tilde{\nu} \epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ 381' 106 Sa; tr rell

The order having the number after "years" parallels exactly the preceding clause giving Moses' age; $\eta\tilde{\nu} \epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu \acute{o}\gamma\delta\omicron\eta\kappa\omicron\nu\tau\alpha$; there the order is assured, the tradition being unanimous. Ra was probably correct in accepting that order in the case of Aaron's age as well.

Ra also adopted a shorter text by following B in the omission of $\eta\tilde{\nu}$, which cannot be correct. Nor can the transposition of $\eta\tilde{\nu}$ and $\epsilon\tau\tilde{\omega}\nu$ in A+ be correct if the conclusion of the preceding paragraph be accepted. The order with the least difficulty is that of F+ which has been taken as original text. Stylistically it is also satisfying in that it neatly balances with the preceding clause.

94 $\tau\omicron\upsilon \text{Ἰσραὴλ} \nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ B 56'-129 130] $\kappa\tau\eta\nu\omega\nu \tau\omega\nu$ (> 120-128') $\nu\iota\omega\nu$ (> 121; om $\tau\omega\nu \nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ 19' 44 628 59; $\tau\omicron\upsilon$ pro $\tau\omega\nu \nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$ 84 318 55) $\overline{\eta\eta\lambda}$ ($\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\eta\lambda\iota\tau\omega\nu$ 107') A 29-58-135 126-413 b⁽⁻³¹⁴⁾ d⁻¹²⁵ n⁻⁷⁵ 30'-85 t 121' z⁽⁻⁴⁰⁷⁾ 55 59 76' 646 Arab Bo^A Sa Pal Syh; $\tau\omicron\upsilon \omicron\iota\kappa\omicron\upsilon \overline{\eta\eta\lambda}$ x; $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega\nu$ 75; $\nu\iota\omega\nu \overline{\eta\eta\lambda}$ rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The A+ reading is clearly secondary; it is taken directly from the end of the preceding clause. Accordingly only the sparsely supported reading of the lemma and the popular $\nu\iota\omega\nu \overline{\eta\eta\lambda}$ need be seriously considered. The context reads $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu \tau\omega\nu \tau\omicron\upsilon \text{Ἰσραὴλ} \nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu$. The B+ reading must be adjudged original in spite of its weak support since it would be difficult to explain scribal deviation from $\nu\iota\omega\nu \overline{\eta\eta\lambda}$ to the reading of Exod, whereas the popular reading would be ex par: in fact $\tau\omega\nu \nu\acute{\iota}\omega\nu \text{Ἰσραὴλ}$ actually occurs in the preceding clause.

1235 $\acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\acute{\alpha} \kappa\alpha\iota \chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\alpha}$] $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\alpha \kappa\alpha\iota \acute{\alpha}\rho\gamma\upsilon\rho\alpha$ A M oI^{'-15'} C^{"-73 77} d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ s t 318' 18 59 76' 130 646 Latcod 104(vid) Arab Arm Bo

The collocation "silver and gold" or "gold and silver," whether as adjectives or nouns shows no particular pattern in the Pentateuch, though in the later books of the Greek O.T. "gold and silver" is far more frequent. In Gen "silver and gold" ob-

tains at 24³⁵ 53; in Exod “silver and gold” occurs (as adjectives) at 32² 11² 12³⁵ but as nouns for “gold and silver” at 25³ 31⁴ 35⁵ 32. The latter also obtains in Num 31²², but the reverse is found in the three Deut passages (8¹³ 17¹⁷ 29¹⁷). It is by no means certain which order is original in the above passage, and the evidence of our oldest Greek witness has been taken as normative. The variant order may then be due to the influence of the favoured order in the later books of the O.T.

1625 (σάββατα) σήμερον / τῷ κυρίῳ B 15'-58 130] σημερον σαββατα τῷ κω 127 30' Aeth; > 458; κω τῷ θω 707; + (※Syh) σημερον 376 Syh; om σημερον b 75; tr rell

At first blush it would seem that the Exod text is hex rather than original. After all it is supported by O texts and is the order of $\mathfrak{M}$. On the other hand, the reading of 376 and Syh is significant. It has σημερον both before and after τῷ κυρίῳ but the one after is under the asterisk and the source is given as being οἱ γ'. In other words, Origen had the Exod reading in his parent text. Of course that text may have been secondary as well, but if so the fact that some O texts support it has no particular significance. The popular word order is probably due to a scribal attempt at improving the Greek by placing the time word at the end of the clause.

1823 ἤξει] post τόπον (εαυτου) tr O⁷²-15 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$; ad fin tr B = Ra

In $\mathfrak{M}$ the verb יבא comes after מקמו and Origen changed the order to conform to $\mathfrak{M}$. B uniquely has it after μετ' εἰρήνης, whereas all other witnesses have it before εἰς τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον. Here the weight of evidence makes the popular order almost certainly original. That B has a number of unique secondary readings is clear from ch. IV above. Only an undue reverence for the text of B could impel Ra to adopt this reading.

2116 θανάτῳ τελευτάτῳ] τελευτησει (-ση 56-664) θανατῳ B 82 56-664 527 120'-128'-628 426 799 = Ra; θανατω τελευτησει 58'-707 129 127^c 392 Sa; θανατω θανατουσθω C^{''} (-14 422) 246 s (-343) 59 424* 509

The formula מות יומת occurs four times in this section (vv. 12 15 16 17) and in each case the free infinitive is rendered by θανάτῳ preceding the verb. The transposed order in a few mss (including B) is simply an error. Nor is the future indicative to be taken seriously. True, such is found at 19¹² (cf also 31¹⁴ 15), but in the context of the law code the third singular imperative is to be expected.

What might be uncertain is whether τελευτάτῳ or θανατουσθω is to be preferred. In vv. 12 15 θανατούσθω is certainly original; in v. 12 no τελευτατω variant obtains; in v. 15 only four mss (707 n) support τελευτατω. In v. 16 θανατουσθω is a C s variant and τελευτάτῳ seems original. V. 17 is problematic: τελευτάτῳ] θανατουσθω A F M^{txt} O^{''}-82 C^{''} (-414') b d 56* 85^{mg}-130^{mg}-344^{mg} t x y 18 46 55 59 76' 509 646'. There is no compelling argument for either reading and τελευτάτῳ has been chosen on the basis of the oldest ms. Accordingly, the first two must have had θανατούσθω and the last two verses, τελευτάτῳ.

2131 κερατίση / ἢ θυγατέρα] tr B 82 b 44 129 z 424 426 Lat^{cod} 100 Arm = Ra

In $\mathfrak{M}$ the verb is repeated, occurring both after בן and בת . In the Greek tradition it only occurs once, and the question is in which position did Exod have it. I suspect that the B+ reading represents the secondary position since it makes for smoother Greek. In other words, the *lectio difficilior* is represented by Exod.

It should be added that this is also the pattern in v. 32, but there it is due to the fact that $\mathfrak{M}$ has the verb only once, i.e. *παῖδα κερατίσῃ . . . ἢ παιδίσκειν*. It might be noted that Arm “corrects” in v. 32 in the same way as the B reading (and Arm) in v. 31.

2510 (*κυμάτια*) *στρεπτά χρυσᾶ* B 15-376-767 19' 127^c x 527 55 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 102 Syh] om *στρ.* F^c 58 Aeth^C; om *χρ.* A 29' 127* s 84^{mt} 68'-126 76*; tr rell

$\mathfrak{M}$ has זר וזה . The word זר “molding” occurs three times in this chapter, twice in ch. 30 (vv. 3 4) and five times in ch. 37. The abbreviated Greek text rendering the Hebrew of ch. 37 never included a rendering for it, but those of chh. 25 and 30 do.

2523 *στρεπτά κυμάτια (χρυσᾶ)* for זר וזה

2524 *στρεπτόν κυμάτιον (+ χρυσούν* A 15 131^c) for זר וזה B

303 *στρεπτήν στεφάνην χρυσήν* for זר וזה

304 *στρεπτήν στεφάνην αὐτοῦ* for זר וזה

From this it is clear that Exod interpreted זר as a twisted chain or rim, i.e. that *στρεπτός* is part of its translation. Thus at 2510 *κυμάτια στρεπτά* stands for זר . That the word *στρεπτά* is sub obelo in hex simply shows that Origen's knowledge of Hebrew was not profound and that he looked for one Greek word to equal one Hebrew word. The popular change in word order must be secondary since *χρυσᾶ* clearly represents זה .

2625 *καὶ δύο βάσεις τῷ στύλῳ τῷ ἐνὶ | εἰς ἀμφοτέρα τὰ μέρη αὐτοῦ*] pr *εἰς ἀμφοτέρα τὰ μέρη αὐτοῦ* 68'-120-128' 426 Sa; om *εἰς — αὐτοῦ* F^{b2} 58 125 = $\mathfrak{M}$; om *καί — ἐνὶ* F 707-767 53-129 127 x 527 407-628 18 799 ^{Lat}cod 102: homoiot; tr B 15-82*-376 55 Arm Syh = Ra

The statement about the number of bases for the columns occurs in vv. 19, 21 and 25. In vv. 19 and 21 the statement “two bases for the one column for both its sides” occurs twice, presumably in the Hebrew distributive sense. The problem occurs with the phrase *εἰς ἀμφοτέρα τὰ μέρη αὐτοῦ* which only has a Hebrew counterpart for a double occurrence in v. 19.

The Hebrew of v. 19 for the phrase is לשתי ידתי . Difficult is the architectural term ידות , plural of יד “hand,” and usually interpreted as protuberances, thus “tenons.” According to the Hebrew of v. 19 each קרש (an upright frame support for the sides of the tent 10 cubits long and 1.5 cubits wide and made of wood) had two bases for both its (i.e. of the frame) tenons. The Greek rendered קרש throughout somewhat curiously by *στύλοι*, but had trouble with the term ידות which it interpreted by *μέρη* “sides.” The translator pictured the columns or planks as having two bases placed on the two sides.¹⁾ Since two bases per column seemed unusual, the translator added

¹⁾ For its understanding cf ch. VI.

even where the Hebrew did not have לַשְׁתֵּי יָדָיו the fact that the two bases were for the two sides (i.e. ends) of the *στυλος*.

In v. 25 the phrase occurs only once; only mss 68'-120-128' 426 and Sa have it repeated presumably under the influence of vv. 19 and 21. The problem in v. 25 is: Did the translator add the explanatory *εἰς* phrase after the first "two bases for the one column" or after the second? That it originally occurred only after the second seems preferable for two reasons. The support for the earlier position is extremely sparse, and secondly, if the phrase is to be helpful at all, it belongs at the end. The transposed order may well be due to two influences: its occurrence after *ἐνί* 1° may be due to the influence of the earlier verses, and its omission at the end may be due to Hebrew influence. On the other hand, it is probably simply due to scribal error.

276 *φορεῖς* / *τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ*] *τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ αναφορεῖς* B^c 82 129 z⁻¹²⁶ 426; tr B* x 55 = Ra;
αναφορεῖς τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ αναφορεῖς 15-376 Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

It is clear that Exod had only one instance of (*ανα*)*φορεῖς* here, and that hex corrected the situation by adding *αναφορεῖς* where it was absent. Since only few witnesses lack the noun before *τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ* (only B 82 129 y z⁻¹²⁶ 55 426), it seems reasonable to suggest that Exod had it only in that position, and that the position after it is hex. Whether those mss which omit the word in first position were influenced by hex or not is difficult to determine but it is fully possible. If their parent text had it in both places (note that hex apparently also had *αναφορεῖς* for *φορεῖς*), the omission creating B+ may well have been due to an attempt to omit the repetition. In any event Exod had *φορεῖς* before *τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ*.

2714 *τῶν ἱστίων* / *τὸ ὕψος*] tr B 82 f⁻¹²⁹ x 392 z 55 426 799 Bo Syh = Ra
2715 *τῶν ἱστίων* / *τὸ ὕψος*] tr n s Bo Syh

In neither case is $\mathfrak{M}$ helpful since there is no equivalent for *τὸ ὕψος*. In both cases the context reads *πέντε καὶ δέκα πήχεων τῶν ἱστίων τὸ ὕψος*. $\mathfrak{M}$ has חמש עשרה אמה in v. 14, but in v. 15 it lacks אמה though it is supplied by Sam. It is clear from v. 14 that the hangings are to be 15 cubits, not as the Hebrew of v. 15 has it "fifteen hangings;" in other words the interpretative gloss *τὸ ὕψος* is quite correct.

Furthermore it is clear that the two verses are closely related, the one describes the one side, the other describes the other side. It is usual throughout the description of the tabernacle when the specifications are identical for matching sides that those specifications be repeated in full, and so they are here. Exod repeats and it is unlikely that the order of the phrase in question would vary between the two verses. The variant in each case is probably created to simplify the text. With *τῶν ἱστίων* immediately following *πήχεων* some ambiguity might arise. The more difficult order is clearly original.

287 *ἔσονται αὐτῷ* / *συνέχουσαι*] *ἔσονται συνεχουσαι αὐτῷ* 57 f⁻¹²⁹ 392 799; tr B 72 129 55
Lat^{codd} 91 94—96 Pal Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$; om *αὐτῷ* Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth Arm; + *αὐτῷ* A F M
ol-15-29 Cⁿ⁻⁵⁷ 500 44-107' s t 318 18 46 59 76' 426 509 Bo

ⲙ has חֲבֵרֶת יִהְיֶה לוֹ. Exod also has an added explanatory gloss: *ἐτέρα τὴν ἐτέραν*. Mss O⁷²-707 n 30' tranpose *ἔσονται αὐτῷ* after *ἐτέραν*, and the gloss is omitted by 72^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 Syh^{LXXT}.

That the popular addition of *αὐτῷ* is secondary is quite clear. Exod would hardly have had the *αὐτῷ* repeated so as to read *ἔσονται αὐτῷ συνεχουσai αὐτῷ*. It should also be noted that *ἔσονται* is supported in its place by the fragmentary Qumran ms 805.

The question that remains is that of word order. The order represented by B+ is a correction to conform to the Hebrew, possibly hex but hardly original. What may actually have been hex is not certain because of the *ἐτέρα τὴν ἐτέραν* gloss. Did hex correct by placing *ἔσονται αὐτῷ* after *ἐτέραν* or immediately after *συνεχουσai*?

2829 (τὸ) δὲ αὐτό] om δέ B Cyr Ad 744 Bo^A; tr 82 b 55 = Ra

Why Ra should have adopted τὸ αὐτὸ δέ is puzzling. The word δέ is a postpositive particle normally appearing immediately after the first word of a clause, and the popular order is used almost exclusively in Exod.

315 καί | εἰς τὰ ἔργα B Fb² O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15'-707¹ f 392 55 799 Cyr Ad 649] om εἰς τὰ ἔργα 426; + και Fb 767; tr rell

The fuller context reads καὶ τὰ λιθουργικὰ καὶ εἰς τὰ ἔργα τὰ τεκτονικὰ τῶν ξύλων, i. e. "both stone masonry and for carpentry labours with wood," a fully sensible division of work and understanding the labours rather differently from ⲙ which refers to "both in the cutting of stones (i. e. gems) for setting and in the carving of wood." That the B text represents the original text is clear from the growth of the tradition through hex. Exod had at 2817 understood מִלֵּאָה . . . מִלֵּאָה as referring to settings for stones not in metal but in fabrics; cf note at 2817. Here this interpretation seems excluded and so it is simply left untranslated. Hex accordingly added *πληρωσεως* after *λιθουργικά*. On the other hand, the term *ובחרשת* was translated by *εἰς τὰ ἔργα . . . ξύλων*. Origen misunderstood this and took τὰ τεκτονικά to be the rendering for *בחרשת*, making *εἰς τὰ ἔργα* a plus over against the Hebrew, and so marked it with an obelus, and since καί represented the first element in *ובחרשת* placed it between *ἔργα* / *τά*.

327 κατὰβηθι (τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν)] post τάχος tr z Aeth; post ἐντεῦθεν tr B 15' 129 Cyr Gl 529 Sa = Ra

ⲙ has only 77; accordingly Syh has τὸ τάχος ἐντεῦθεν sub obelo. Exod's parent text probably had a text amplified from the parallel passage in Deut 9¹² מִהַר מִזֶּה 77. There is no basis for changing the word order for Exod. It is the same as in Deut where the z order is supported by 53' but all other witnesses support the original order. Changes in word order in the tradition were probably impelled by *βάδιζε* occurring immediately before it. A number of mss, principally from C" and s, have alleviated the tension by adding *και* between the two imperatives. An even larger group of witnesses in the tradition did so in the Deut passage, but in both passages only the

critical text can have impelled all the variants in the tradition, and is therefore to be judged original.

3428 τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα / ἐπὶ τῶν πλακῶν B 15' 129 120' 55 Sa] tr rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The context of Exod reads καὶ ἔγραψεν τὰ . . . πλακῶν τῆς διαθήκης τοὺς δέκα λόγους. $\mathfrak{M}$ has the text underlying the transposition of the majority text. Exod has changed the intent of the Hebrew with τῆς διαθήκης modifying πλακῶν instead of ῥήματα, whereas the hex (?) correction of the word order has also corrected the syntactic relations. The translator may well have had in mind the הברית לוח of Deut 9^a (cf also v. 11). In fact reference is actually made to לוח העדות in the next verse (29), though the translator fails to render העדות, τῆς διαθήκης being added sub $\mathfrak{X}$ by Origen there. It should also be noted that $\mathfrak{M}$ has no counterpart for ταῦτα; its addition may also have facilitated the word order of Exod.

3823 τὴν βάσιν] et τὸ πυρεῖον tr B 15' f n 30' 71' 392 68'-120' 55 426 799 = Ra

The altar utensils are in disarray and in disagreement with $\mathfrak{M}$, which has “the pots, and the shovels, and the bowls (את המזרקת), and the forks and the fire pans.” The O mss have τὴν βασιν καὶ τὸ γεισιον καὶ τὰς φιάλας καὶ τὰς κρεάγρας καὶ τὸ πυρεῖον.

Exod, however, has only four in the list, namely, τὴν βάσιν, τὸ πυρεῖον, τὰς φιάλας and τὰς κρεάγρας, i. e. the base, the fire pan, the bowls and the forks. O has inherited all four, placed number two at the end and added τὸ γεισιον in the number two slot. The variant text shown at the head of this note has the first two inverted. It is probably secondary since at least Origen's parent text must have had the majority's placement of τὴν βάσιν in first place. In other words in the third century A. D. it stood first; accordingly it has been accepted as critical text.

It should also be noted that $\mathfrak{M}$ has the entire list articulated and without pronominal suffixes. The hex witnesses also witness to a lack of αὐτου throughout, but Exod has αὐτου only after the first one. A large number of witnesses (A F M' oI-29 b 44-107' n t 527 γ ⁻³⁹² 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth^C Bo) add αὐτου after the second, whereas after φιάλας only four witnesses (118'-537 527) and after κρεάγρας only three (527 ^{Lat}cod 104 Bo) have αὐτου. Probably original is an αὐτου only after βάσιν.

3824 εὐρεῖς / τοῖς μοχλοῖς] tr B 15' 129 71' 55 426 = Ra

The order of the variant would not have been chosen by Ra were it not supported by B. The codex, however, also has another change in word order in the context. The verse continues with ὥστε αἶρουν τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἐν αὐτοῖς. Codex B has the prepositional phrase after αἶρουν; this has no further ms support and is rejected by Ra. Of the five times that αἶρουν occurs in Exod with an accusative as well as an ἐν phrase, four have the accusative preceding the prepositional phrase (30^a 38^a 10²⁴), and once (25²⁶) in reverse order. Ra is surely right in following the popular order. For the position of εὐρεῖς the situation is much less certain. The word occurs only three

times (vv. 4, 10, 24) and only in v. 4 is it modified by a dative and this follows the adjective. Since the support for B's order in v. 24 is sparse, it seems reasonable to have the dative follow the adjective here as well.

G. Pronouns

1. A pronoun may have been added by Origen because of his Hebrew text. This is clear when that pronoun is under the asterisk.

46 *χειρα* 1° 73 *b* 129 *n*⁻⁶²⁸ *x* Latcod 101] + (※Arm^{mss}) *αυτου* rell = Ra *℞*

That the *αυτου* is secondary (hex) is clear from the asterisk in the Arm mss, and the weakness of the support for Exod is irrelevant. Note the same phenomenon in v. 7: *χειρα*] + (※Syh) *αυτου* O-29-618 52'-78-126-313'-414*-422 106 53' *n*⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ *t y* 59 Latcod 100 Arm Co Syh. There too the *αυτου* has been added by Origen under the asterisk and is of course secondary.

1021 *την χειρα* M 64^{txt}-135-707-708 106-107 127 30-343' 370 *x* 18 55 130 509] + (※Arm^{mss}) *σου* rell = Ra *℞*

Admittedly the asterisk tradition in Arm^{mss} is not always accurate, but there is no good reason to question the correctness of the tradition here.¹⁾ In similar contexts the *σου* is often not attested in our oldest witnesses and presumably represents the original translation, since in good Greek style *σου* modifying *χειρα* after a singular imperative would not obtain. The following list gives the evidence for *χειρα* with or without *σου* in such a context. All instances represent *ךך* in *℞*.

- 44 *ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα* A B F 15*-707 121' 68'-120' 55 59 Phil I 108^{te} LatAug *Loc in hept* II 14 "graecus"] + *σου* rell
- 46 *εἰσένεγκε τὴν χεῖρά σου* omnes
- 47 *εἰσένεγκε τὴν χεῖρά σου*] om *σου b*
- 719 *ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα* A 58-82' *x*] + *σου* rell
- 85 (*ἔκτεινον*) *τῇ χειρὶ* (*τὴν ὁδὸν σου*) A B 970 426 56'-129 127 *x* 392 130] om *τῇ χειρὶ* 799; + *σου* rell
- 922 *ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου*] om *σου* 707* 527
- 1012 *ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρα* B 707 19' 127 392] + *σου* rell
- 1416 26 *ἔκτεινον τὴν χεῖρά σου* omnes

The evidence is similarly inconsistent for *μου* under analogous conditions. In all cases *℞* has *יד*.

- 320 *ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα* A B 15'-72-707 628 68'-120'] + *μου* rell
- 68 *ἐξέτεινα τὴν χεῖρά μου* omnes
- 74 *ἐπιβαλὼ τὴν χεῖρά μου* omnes
- 75 *ἐκτεινων τὴν χεῖρα* A* B 82' 120'] + *μου* rell
- 915 *ἀποστείλας τὴν χεῖρα* B 707 78^c 120' Latcod 104] om *τ. χ.* 246; + *μου* (*σου* 53') rell

In these cases where the governing form is participial no *μου* is present in Exod, but where it is a finite form there is a *μου*. But this may well be irrelevant.

¹⁾ These materials are now conveniently presented in C. Cox, *Armenian Materials Preserved in the Armenian Version*, Chico, CA, 1986.

For third person singular suffixed יד, the evidence is unmixed; the translator did not use a genitive after *χειρα*. In the following list $\mathfrak{M}$ always has יד.

- 44 *ἐκτείνας τὴν χειρά*] + *αυτου* 527 Arm Co Syh
 46 (*εἰσὴνεγκεν*) *τὴν χειρά* 73 *b* 129 *n*⁻⁶²⁸ *x* Lat^{cod} 101] *αυτην* 107'-125; + (※Arm^{mss}) *αυτου* rell
 47 *εἰσὴνεγκεν τὴν χειρά*] + (※Syh) *αυτου* A O-29-618 52'-78-126-313'-414*-422 106 53' *n*⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ *t* *γ* 59 Lat^{cod} 100 Arm Co Syh
 86 *ἐξέτεινεν* ... *τὴν χειρά* 970] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O⁻⁵⁸-15 527 Aeth Arm Bo^A Sa Syh
 817 *ἐξέτεινεν* ... *τῇ χειρὶ*] + *αυτου* 15-376' 628 Lat^{cod} 106 Aeth Arab Arm
 1022 *ἐξέτεινεν* ... *τὴν χειρά* B 82' C' *b f* *n*⁻⁷⁵ *x* 392-527 509 646' Lat^{cod} 104] + *αυτου* rell
 1421 *ἐξέτεινεν* ... *τὴν χειρά*] + (※Syh) *αυτου* O-15 59 Eus VI 98 verss
 1427 *ἐξέτεινεν* ... *τὴν χειρά*] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* O-15 527 59 Aeth Arab Arm Co Pal Syh
 1711 *ἐπῆρεν* ... *τὰς χειράς*] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* (*εαυτου* 426^c) O⁻⁵⁸-15-707 527 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh
 1711 *καθῆκεν τὰς χειράς*] + (※Arm^{mss} Syh) *αυτου* 15-376'-707 527 Aeth Arab Arm Co Syh

2. There are numerous instances where a pronoun is added but with no asterisk anywhere in the tradition. The presumption is that the plus is hex but that the asterisk has been lost in the course of transmission.

425 *πόδας* A B 15-707 *f* 628 68'-120'] + *αυτου* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The context is the tale of Zipporah's circumcision of her son on the occasion when the angel of the Lord was seeking to kill Moses. Zipporah then *προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας* and said "The blood of my son's circumcision has stayed" (the execution of Moses). Exod has tried to make sense out of a difficult passage.

By not rendering the suffix of רגליי, however, the passage becomes ambiguous, probably intentionally so. In the Hebrew it is clear that she threw the foreskin at Moses' feet, but without the Hebrew the Greek might well mean that she threw it at her own feet — in fact, that would be a normal understanding of the passage.

This introduction of ambiguity into the passage fits in with the interpretation of what she said as well. The Greek *ἔστη τὸ αἷμα τῆς περιτομῆς τοῦ παιδίου μου* can by no stretch of the imagination be thought to be an adequate, let alone correct, interpretation of *כי חתן דמים אתה לי*, or in v. 26 of *חתן דמים למולת*, but what it does do is to mitigate, if not void, the guilt attached to Moses in the matter. Here the lack of *αυτου* is certainly *lectio difficilior* and is probably to be preferred.

104 *θέλης*] + *συ* B O⁻⁷²-15' 56-129 527 120-128' Arm Pal Syh = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

The pronoun is unlikely to be original. The pattern of *συ* following the second person singular finite verb is rare in Exod (82 18¹⁸ 20¹⁰ 34^{9 10}). In two of these (18¹⁸ 20¹⁰) the *σύ* is necessary since it occurs in a collocation "thou and ...". It does occur occasionally after a singular imperative as well, 11⁸ 18¹⁹ 19²⁴ 24¹ 33¹ 34¹¹, (of which all but 18¹⁹ and 34¹¹ are in the pattern "thou ..."). It is of course quite otiose

in Greek and the translator on the whole is guided by his desire to use good Greek style. On the other hand, *σὺ* is useful in Greek for emphasis, and then it would usually precede the verb.

It might also be noted that the pattern of support for the *σὺ* variant with O^{-72-15'} Arm Syh commonly represents the hex text.

20¹² *μήτερα* A B* F^b 56* 59 Matth 154 19¹⁹ Marc 10^{19te} Luc 18^{20te} Eph 62 Phil I 270 Bas II 500 Cyr III 1353 Did *Eccl* 81.15 ^{Lat}patr mult] + *σου* Marc 7¹⁰ 10^{19ap} Luc 18^{20ap} Anast 1768 Chr passim Did *Hiob* 154.17 *P_s* passim Eus VIII 2.129 GregNaz II 289 Or VI 50 *Eph* 568s Ptol 58 Theoph 222 rell = *℞*

In assessing the support of the tradition for Exod the inclusion of the abundant Latin patristic evidence as well as some Greek evidence must be placed in proper perspective. It is unlikely to be worth much since except for Phil it is probably based on N.T. evidence rather than on Exod. The N.T. evidence is divided, and only a few mss support the text of Exod. This support does include ancient support, however, since A B* Phil and three N.T. writers witness to a shorter text.

The fact that the majority of witnesses support the genitive pronoun is easily explained. The parallel Deut 5¹⁶ passage has *σου* and *℞* also supports it. It is thus abundantly clear that *σου* is not Exod but secondary in the tradition.

27¹⁰ *ψαλίδες* B 82-618*-767 f⁻¹²⁹ x 392 76' 799] + *eius* Aeth; + *των στύλων* 414'; + *αυτων* ^{Lat}codd Al: 91 94—96 rell = Ra *℞*

As a general rule when genitive pronouns representing pronominal suffixes in *℞* are not attested by one of the oldest uncials, A or B, it is safe to conclude that the shorter reading is to be preferred. Normally Ra follows this rule if B lacks the pronoun, even when it does so uniquely, but here he did not. The repetition of these pronouns is bad Greek style and is really a Hebraism. Here too the addition of *αυτων* is secondary, possibly though not necessarily, hex in origin.

32¹³ *ὁμοσας* B 767 129 n 55 319* 426 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm] + *αυτοις* (*αυτους* 799) rell = *℞*

The clause *οἱς ὁμοσας αυτοις* is a Hebraism representing a word for word rendition of *אשר נשבעת להם*, a kind of barbarism into which Exod falls only occasionally. The addition of *αυτοις* is clearly secondary here, probably a hex plus.

34⁹ *ἀμαρτίας*] + *ημων* B O-15' C-413 19 f n 30' x 628 55 799 ^{Lat}cod 103 Arab Arm Co Syh = Ra *℞*

The context reads *τὰς ἀμαρτίας καὶ τὰς ἀνομίας ἡμῶν*. *℞* as is normal for Hebrew has first plural suffixes on both nouns. In such cases Exod is not consistent. Sometimes a genitive pronoun occurs only with the second, at times only with the first, and Exod often repeats the pronoun in imitation of the Hebrew. Here the pattern of support clearly shows the hex nature of the reading with O mss Arab and Syh supporting the reading. It might be added that the nouns *ἀμαρτίας* and *ἀνομίας* are also transposed in the following witnesses: O-15' C-413 19 129 n 30' x 628 55 ^{Lat}cod 103 Arab Arm Co Syh in agreement with *℞*. Note that this list of support in-

cludes many of those supporting the *ημων* variant. Both readings are obviously secondary.

3420 δώσεις B 978(vid) O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15-707 392 126-128'-407-628 55 426 Lat^{codd} 100 103] pr *αυτου* 767 n Aeth Arm Co; + *αυτω* 246 x 318 509; + *αυτου* rell

The reference here is to what is to happen if one does not redeem the first born of an ass with a sheep, then *τιμην δώσεις*. Here *℣* has וְעַרְפָּתוֹ, "then you shall break its neck." The phrase *τιμην δώσεις* means "you shall pay a price." Obviously the translator read עֲרַכְתִּי; cf Lev 27 passim for עֲרַכְךָ in the sense of "value, worth, price." The popular addition of *αυτου* is an ad sensum addition, and happens to equal *℣*. It would be difficult to explain the loss of an original *αυτου* in the tradition, so that most likely it is the shorter text that is original.

3817 λύχνους B 58-381'-707 118'-537 75 71' 426 799 Phil III 45 Lat^{codd} 91 94 95 100 Arm] *λυχνοι* 509 Lat^{cod} 100; + *αυτη* A F M' 29 d t 527 18 46 59 319; + *αυτης* (-τοις 129) rell = *℣*

℣ has "and he made its seven lamps." The antecedent of "its" is המנרה. Exod takes care of the antecedent (*λυχνίαν* of v. 13) by a prepositional phrase ἐπ' αὐτῆς. The addition of *αυτης* after *λύχνους* may well be hex or an earlier hebraizing correction, but it is otiose in view of the ἐπ' αὐτῆς which follows it.

3. Occasionally a pronoun is added against *℣*.

213 τύπτεις] pr *συ* B 29-58-82-376 19' f 628 γ⁻¹²¹ z 55 59^c 130 799 = Ra Tar

For Exod the present tense accompanied by ἐγώ or σύ is reserved for the personal pronoun plus participle in Hebrew. Note the following: 214 σὺ θέλεις (אתה אמר); 629 ἐγὼ λέγω (אני דבר); 717 ἐγὼ τύπτω (אני מכה); 82 βούλει σὺ and ἐγὼ τύπτω (אתה מאן אתה); 821 ἐγὼ ἐπαποστέλλω (הנני משליח); 914 ἐγὼ ἐξαποστέλλω (אני שלח); 918 164 ἐγὼ ὕω (הנני ממטיר); 104 ἐγὼ ἐπάγω (הנני מביא); 114 ἐγὼ εἰσπορεύομαι (אני יוצא); 1315 ἐγὼ θύω (אני זבח); 1814 σὺ ποιεῖς (אתה עשה) and σὺ κάθησαι (אתה יושב); 1818 σὺ ποιεῖς (אתה עשה); 199 ἐγὼ παραγίνομαι (בא אנכי בא); 2320 ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω (אנכי שלח); 258 ἐγὼ (σοι) δεικνύω (אני מראה); 3218 ἐγὼ ἀκούω (אנכי שמע); 3410 ἐγὼ τίθημι (אני כרת); 3411 ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαι (אנכי מצוך) and ἐγὼ ἐκβάλλω (הנני גרש). I have excluded the verb εἶναι from the list.

The present tense without an accompanying pronoun occurs but rarely in Exod. I have noted 515 ποιεῖς; 1415 βοᾷς; 1816 διακρίνω and συμβιβάζω. In each case it is a rendering of an inflected verb, and never of a participle.

The pronouns ἐγώ and σύ with other tenses is quite a different matter. Either the future or the aorist may be accompanied by a pronoun, which may or may not have a Hebrew counterpart. Such pronouns are usually intended for emphasis or contrast.

219 τὰ πρόβατα] + *ημων* B M O^{''-29'} 135 77^c 19' d f n t x 392-527 z 18 55 76' 130 799 Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth Arab Arm Sa = Ra

The pronominal plus may well be a correct interpretation; it is, however, not original text. $\mathfrak{M}$ has אֵין תִּתְּנָה , i.e. it has no suffix. It is true that occasionally Exod added a pronoun even when it was not present in its parent text, but the usual pattern is quite different. Many times Exod fails to render pronominal suffixes in the parent text particularly when the sense is obvious from the context. This can be seen from Lists 1 and 2 in chap. I. The translator tried to follow a middle course between rendering his parent text accurately and his own feeling for good Greek narrative style. The pronoun here is almost certainly secondary.

176 $\delta \lambda αός]$ + $\mu ου$ B M^{ms} 82 f 318' 120-128-628 799 Latcodd 102 104 = Ra

The phrase "my people" or "thy people" occurs many times in Exod and even when $\mathfrak{M}$ has no pronominal suffix Exod at times adds $\mu ου$ / $σου$ (312 54 118 1513 331). In these contexts it is usually in such a phrase as $σὺ καὶ ὁ λαός σου$, or in a phrase where the pronoun fits naturally. Here the $\mu ου$ is quite unexpected — the clause reads $καὶ πῖεται ὁ λαός$ — and the $\mu ου$ is probably an ex par gloss.

278 $οὕτως ποιήσεις]$ + $αυτο$ ($αυτω$ 767 75) B F^a 82-767 19' d f n t 318 55 Arm = Ra

$\mathfrak{M}$ has כִּן יַעֲשֶׂה . The absolute use of "thus do/did," i.e. without object occurs a few times in $\mathfrak{M}$ but only once is it rendered with pronominal object in Exod. These are $οὕτως ἐποίησαν$ 76 1228 50 3911; $οὕτως ἐποίησεν$ 4014 and cf 278, but 3923 $οὕτως ἐποίησαν αὐτά$ (> O-707 71' 392 Latcod 100 Arab Arm Syh). Though the formula does not occur often, it follows $\mathfrak{M}$ throughout except in 3923 in not supplying an object. At 278 it seems to be a Byzantine variant also followed by B F^a; it is certainly secondary.

2711 $καὶ αἱ βάσεις 2^ο]$ + $αυτων$ B 72 44 509 = Ra

The entire phrase is quite rightly sub obelo in Arm^{ms} and Syh since it has no basis in $\mathfrak{M}$. In fact the entire phrase is problematic and were there a bit more support for the omission of the phrase than just F^b Aeth^C Arm^{te} one might be tempted to consider it Exod. It not only has no support in $\mathfrak{M}$, it is also a difficult phrase. Whose bases are they? Presumably of the $στύλοι$, but these were referred to earlier in the verse as made of bronze. Here it succeeds $αἱ ψαλίδες τῶν στύλων$ and it is said that they were plated with silver. Does it then mean that the bases were of silver plated bronze? In any event, there is no good reason for adding $αυτων$. Greek normally would not add the word; its reference must be $στύλων$, and the variant is secondary.

4. Genitive pronouns and coordinate nouns.

The normal Hebrew pattern for pronominal possession is the pronominal suffix, i.e. "his hands" is יָדָיו ; if coordinate nouns are both pronominally possessed, both nouns are suffixed, i.e. "his hands and feet" is יָדָיו ורגליו . What is here reviewed is how Exod deals with such repeated suffixes, since in good Greek usage two things should be noted: a) no genitive pronoun is used at all if the sense is clear without it,

and b) if a genitive pronoun is needed it normally occurs but once with coordinate nouns, preferably with the first, though the last is also possible.

Striking is the fact that the first generalization is very rare in Exod. References to "length and breadth (and height)" are indeed used absolutely (25⁹ 16 22 28¹⁶ 30² 36¹⁶ 37¹⁶), but beyond this pattern only the following occur: 4²⁰ *τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ παιδιά*; 10²⁴ *πλὴν τῶν προβάτων καὶ τῶν βοῶν* (though *ύμων* occurs in the next clause); 11¹⁰ *τὰ σημεία καὶ τὰ τέρατα*; 14²³ *ἡ ἵππος Φαραὼ καὶ τὰ ἄρματα καὶ οἱ ἀναβάται*; 14²⁶ *ἐπὶ τε τὰ ἄρματα καὶ τοὺς ἀναβάτας*; 15¹⁹ *σὺν ἄρμασιν καὶ ἀναβάταις*; 18⁵ *καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ καὶ ἡ γυνή*; 29¹⁴ *τὸ δέσμα καὶ τὴν κόπρον*; 29¹⁷ *τὰ ἐνδόσθια καὶ τοὺς πόδας*, and 30²¹ *τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας*.

By far the most common pattern is the literal rendering of the Hebrew, i.e. repeating the relevant genitive pronoun after coordinate nouns, in fact, even adding them when the Hebrew occasionally lacks a suffix. I counted 52 verses containing such patterns of repetition, even up to seven times (20¹⁰) or six (8³ 20¹⁷), but usually two or three.

Renderings of coordinates which fit neither of the above patterns, i.e. the genitive pronoun occurring but not with all the members unfortunately show no consistent pattern. In 11 cases only the first noun is modified usually as the first of two: 7³ *τὰ σημεία μου καὶ τὰ τέρατα*; 8¹¹ *ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ύμων καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπαύλεων*; 17³ *τὰ τέκνα ήμων καὶ τὰ κτήνη*; 20¹² *τὸν πατέρα σου καὶ τὴν μητέρα*; 32² *τῶν γυναικῶν ύμων καὶ θυγατέρων*; 33⁵ *τὰς στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν ύμων καὶ τὸν κόσμον*; 33⁶ *τὸν κόσμον αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν περιστολήν*, and 38²⁷ *τὰς χεῖρας αὐτῶν καὶ τοὺς πόδας*. The last example is supported only by B G-58-82-376 19' 129 x 68'-120' 55. Ms 509 lacks *αὐτῶν*; 15 d⁻¹⁰⁶ n t Aeth Arab Bo Syh have *αὐτων* modifying both nouns, and all other witnesses have the *αὐτῶν* after *πόδας*. I have simply followed the oldest witness for the critical text.

Other instances of only the first noun being modified by a genitive pronoun are 21⁵ *τὸν κύριόν μου καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα καὶ τὰ παιδιά*; 25²⁸ *τὰ τρυβλία αὐτῆς καὶ τὰς θύσκας καὶ τὰ σπονδεῖα καὶ τοὺς κνάθους*; 25³⁰ *ὁ καυλὸς αὐτῆς καὶ οἱ καλαμίσκοι καὶ οἱ κρατῆρες καὶ οἱ σφαιρωτῆρες καὶ τὰ κρίνα*.

There are nine instances in which only the last noun is modified by a pronoun. These are

- 322 *γείτονος καὶ συσκήνου αὐτῆς*
- 109 *τοῖς νεανίσκοις καὶ πρεσβυτέροις . . . σὺν τοῖς υἱοῖς καὶ θυγατράσιν καὶ προβάτοις καὶ βουσὶν ήμων*
- 1232 *τὰ πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς βόας ύμων*
- 149 *οἱ ἱππεῖς καὶ ἡ στρατιὰ αὐτοῦ*
- 1418 *ἐν τοῖς ἄρμασιν καὶ ἵπποις αὐτοῦ*
- 186 *ἡ γυνή καὶ οἱ δύο υἱοὶ σου*
- 2110 *τὰ δέοντα καὶ τὸν ἱματισμὸν καὶ τὴν ὁμιλίαν αὐτῆς*
- 2127 *τοῦ οἰκέτου ἢ . . . τῆς θεραπαίνης αὐτοῦ*
- 2533 *οἱ σφαιρωτῆρες καὶ τὰ κρίνα αὐτῆς*

There are another six instances in which two nouns are modified by a pronoun, and one or more are not.

- 1211 *καὶ τὰ ὑποδήματα ἐν τοῖς ποσὶν ύμων καὶ αἱ βακτηρίαι ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ύμων*
- 1234 *τὰ φυράματα αὐτῶν ἐνδεδεμένα ἐν τοῖς ἱματίοις αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῶν ὤμων*

1417 ἐν πάσῃ τῇ στρατιᾷ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄρμασιν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἵπποις αὐτοῦ
 2024 τὰ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ τὰ σωτήρια ὑμῶν τὰ πρόβατα καὶ τοὺς μόσχους ὑμῶν
 3511 τοὺς ἀναφορεῖς αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ ἱλαστήριον αὐτῆς καὶ τὸ καταπέτασμα
 3914 τὰ σκεύη αὐτῆς καὶ τὰς βάσεις καὶ τοὺς μοχλοὺς αὐτῆς καὶ τοὺς στύλους.

There is no discernible pattern here. In two cases out of four nos. 2 and 4 have the pronoun, another one has pronouns modifying nos. 1 and 3. Out of three nouns, one has pronouns for nos. 1 and 3, and two have them for nos. 1 and 2.

It should also be noted that the tradition throughout shows a great deal of variation. Since no particular pattern seems to obtain, the text chosen has consistently agreed with Ra, i.e. with codex B the oldest witness.

5. Often the tradition will omit an original pronoun.

54 om μου F M O' -29-135 C" f 628 s γ⁻³⁹² 18 55 59 76' 646 Arm Syh = **ℳ**

ℳ has אֶת הָעָם. The μου seems to be deliberate since it is Pharaoh speaking. The translator attributes such hybris to the evil Pharaoh that he even claims Israel as his own people. Its later deletion may not necessarily be due to hebraizing influence but rather have been in the interests of Hebrew piety; after all, the Israelites were always God's people, never Pharaoh's. The μου can only have been original.

72 om αὐτῷ F M^{txt} O" -58 82 (707^{txt}) 118' -537 d n s t 121 18 55 59 76' 509 Latcod 100 Aeth^{CG} Arab Bo Syh = **ℳ**

Though αὐτῷ has no counterpart in **ℳ** it is a typical exegetical nicety characteristic of Exod. This occurs in the Lord's statement to Moses that he is to serve as a god to Pharaoh and Aaron is to function as his prophet. Verse 2a then goes on to say אֶתָּה תְּדַבֵּר אֶת כָּל אֲשֶׁר אֶצְוֶךָ. This could be misinterpreted to mean that Moses would in spite of the preceding statement speak directly to Pharaoh, though the second half of the verse precludes this. In order that a reader might not have even a passing chance to misunderstand, this αὐτῷ is added after λαλήσεις. As so often Exod makes explicit what is already implicit in the text.

713 (ἐλάλησεν) αὐτοῖς] om F M O" -82' C" 107' s 121 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = **ℳ**; post κύριος tr 44' t Sa

Out of the 68 occurrences of the verb all but the following ten instances designate the addressee. 412 ὁ μέλλεις λαλήσαι; 523 λαλήσαι (ἐπὶ τῷ σῷ ὀνόματι)] + αὐτῷ A 58 Bo; 819 (καθάπερ) ἐλάλησεν (κύριος)] + αὐτοῖς 246 Sa; 112 ἀλάησον . . . εἰς τὰ ὄτα τοῦ λαοῦ; 1225 καθότι ἐλάλησεν] + ὑμῖν 426; 1623 ῥῆμα . . . ὁ ἐλάλησεν κύριος; 1919 Μωυσεῖς ἐλάλει, ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἀπεκρίνατο αὐτῷ; 201 ἐλάλησεν κύριος πάντας τοὺς λόγους . . .; 243 λόγους οὓς ἐλάλησεν κύριος; 247 πάντα ὅσα ἐλάλησεν κύριος.

If one examines these ten exceptions carefully, it becomes apparent that in at least six cases the context makes it clear that identifying an addressee would be inappropriate (412 112 1919 201 2437). The usual pattern which the translator follows, regardless of whether **ℳ** has it or not, is to specify the addressee.

1615 (ιδόντες δὲ) αὐτό B 15' -58' -376 f γ⁻¹²¹ 120-128' -628 130 799 Arm Sa] > rell = **ℳ**

Ⲙ has וִירָאוּ, i. e. it has no object of the verb, and it might be suggested that the *αὐτό* is a scribal gloss. But when one examines the many instances of *ιδεῖν* in Exod, it becomes apparent that an object is almost invariably expressed whether Ⲙ has an object or not. In fact only twice does it occur absolutely, 34 *ἔτι προσάγει ἰδεῖν* and as an imperative *ἴδετε* at 1629 (simply as the plural of *ἰδοῦ*). As a participial modifier of a finite verb as in 1615, it occurs only once without an accusative modifier (325 *ἰδὼν Ἀαρὼν ᾠκισμένην*). Nor is there much variation in the tradition (except above). Only at 22 in the expression *ιδόντες δὲ αὐτό* is the object *αὐτό* omitted by mss 376 55 and ^{Lat}cod 100. It is safe to conclude that *αὐτό* is indeed original text in 1615 as well.

1818 om *σύ* 3° B* 72 Aeth Arm = Ra

The pronoun occurs in the clause *οὐ δυνήσῃ ποιεῖν σὺ μόνος*. The *σὺ μόνος* represents לְבַדִּךָ perfectly, and must be part of the translator's work. The versional evidence is not worth much since both Aeth and Arm have *ποιεῖν* at the end of the clause. I suspect that the omission of the pronoun in B* 72 is an auditory error. The succession of the /i/ phoneme in six successive syllables may well have made the dropping of the syllable easy — note /u-di-ní-si-pi-ín-si mo-nos/. Actually the same phenomenon obtains in ms 82's reading of *δυνῇ* for *δυνήσῃ*. The conclusion that *σύ* is original text is unavoidable.

304 (*ποιήσεις*) *αὐτῷ*] > B 15 129 392 55 426 Arm = Ra

Ⲙ has לוֹ (ועשית). When the verb עָשָׂה is modified by a prepositional phrase לְ plus a pronoun in Exod the latter is almost always translated. The exceptions are

2525 *ποιήσεις*] + (⊗ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αὐτῇ* F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15 Cⁿ f^{-56*} s 318 126 646 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 102 Arm Syh

2941 *ποιήσεις* 2°] + (⊗ Arm^{ms} Syh) *αὐτῷ* 376 Arm Syh

Three times the entire phrase remains untranslated: 2636 where it is added by hex (O Syh), and in Ⲙ: 3711 26.

The pronoun occurs correctly without relevant variation in the tradition at 24 1216 204 23 24 219 11 31 257 23 twice 2836 38 303 321 8 21 31 382(372). The remainder is as follows:

274 (*ποιήσεις*) *αὐτῷ*] > Cⁿ 424 Aeth

335 (*ποιήσω*) *σοι*] > F 707* 53' 527 319 646

3422 (*ποιήσεις*) *μοι* omnes. Ⲙ has ἡ.

3610(394) (*ἐποίησεν*) *αὐτό*] *αὐτῷ* 72-376 761 53' 75 343 71' 68'-120* 319

Note that the one instance where the לְ phrase is not rendered by a dative pronoun occurs in the last section of the book.

It is clear that Exod was careful in rendering the prepositional phrases (i. e. *ל* plus pronoun) modifying the verb עָשָׂה. Accordingly *αὐτῷ* has been adjudged original at 304 as well.

3211 (*κυρίου τοῦ θεοῦ*) *αὐτοῦ*] > B 15' f⁽⁻⁵³⁾ z 426 799 Sa = Ra

Ⲙ supports the longer text. Though usually the shorter text is original when it concerns the genitive pronoun, here the longer text is likely preferable. The translator simply does not use the collocation "Lord God" unless there are good exegetical

reasons for it. It is difficult to reconstruct such here. On the other hand, “Lord his/ your/thy/my/our God” is frequently found in Exod.

344 μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ] μετ' αὐτου C-414'; > B 15-618^{xt}-707-767 44 n 619 318 55 426 = Ra

The context in Exod is καὶ ἔλαβεν Μωσῆς μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ τὰς δύο πλάκας, which renders לחת בידו שני יקח. The subject Μωσῆς has been added to avoid any possible confusion since the subject of the preceding clause is κύριος. In an earlier reference to the first two tablets at 32^{is} the phrase בידו also occurs and is there rendered literally by ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ, and later in v. 19 Μωσῆς ἔρριπεν ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν αὐτοῦ τὰς δύο πλάκας. Here the translator avoids a literal rendering but uses μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ instead — μετ' αὐτου would have been adequate as well. The shorter text is probably stylistic in origin. The tradition did find it awkward with one ms, 708, placing it before Μωσῆς, and f⁻¹²⁹ 799 transposing it after πλάκας. It must, however, be original, since the tradition would hardly have supplied such a phrase; a hebraizing correction would rather have added ἐν τη χειρὶ αὐτου or ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτου.

376 αὐτῶν 1°] > B 15 53-56-129 71' 392 55 426 799 = Ra

The context has καὶ τοὺς στύλους αὐτοῦ πέντε καὶ τοὺς κρίκους αὐτῶν which corresponds exactly to **𐤓𐤕**. The text then goes on with καὶ τὰς κεφαλίδας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ψαλίδας αὐτῶν κατεχρύσωσαν χρυσίῳ. That κεφαλίδας and ψαλίδας modify κατεχρύσωσαν is immediately apparent when one sees the Hebrew which has וצפה ראשיהם וזהב וחשקיהם. The absence of αὐτῶν after κρίκους can then hardly be original; since στύλους and κρίκους both modify ἐποίησαν of the preceding verse, the relationship of the two nouns would be completely obscured by the omission of the pronoun. After all, the rings belong to the pillars.

The variant may well have been promoted by a widespread error with respect to αὐτοῦ: αὐτοῦ] αὐτων A B 15' 413-422 129 127 71' 318 68'-120'-126 55 426 799 Arm. The change of the singular pronoun to the plural was undoubtedly due to the influence of αὐτῶν occurring four times in the verse, but it makes an impossible text since there is no plural antecedent. On the other hand, in the text of Exod all four cases of αὐτῶν refer to the στύλους.

6. Changes in number of pronoun.

412 ἄ] ο B 15' b Co = Ra; οσα 58-426 318; ως 72

The pronoun occurs in the context συμβιβάσω σε ἃ μέλλεις λαλῆσαι. **𐤓𐤕** is no guide here since אשׁר is indeclinable. Both singular and plural are possible in this context and one can only decide by looking internally. First of all, the singular is only sparsely supported; secondly, the ο reading could have developed palaeographically since it follows σε, i. e. it is one of the round letters in the uncial text. Furthermore the plural is particularly appropriate since God is going to teach the heavy-tongued Moses the words he is going to say. Though one would like more certainty in the

matter, *ἄ* is more likely to be Exod than the singular. Cf also v. 15 where *συμβιβάσω ὑμᾶς* is followed by *ἄ*, i. e. not by the singular.

423 *αὐτοῦς*] *τον λαον μου* 118'-537 Bo^A; *αυτον* F M O''-15' C'' *d n s t x y* 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 Ach Aeth Arab Arm Bo^B Sa Syh = **℣**

The reference is to *λαός*, a word that occurs extremely frequently in Exod (168 times). The plural is the normal pronoun used in referring to *λαός* in Exod, and not the grammatically congruent singular. In fact, singular pronominal references are quite rare. Only the following obtain. In 9₂ *αὐτοῦ* occurs after *ἐγκρατεῖς* (not the popular *αυτους* but the genitive is good usage in the sense of "to rule over, be master over"). At 18₂₃ *ἐαυτοῦ* occurs in the clause *πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οὗτος ἤξει εἰς τὸν ἐαυτοῦ τόπον μετ' εἰρήνης*. In 33₃ (cf v. 1) the people are referred to in the singular (thus *διὰ τὸν λαὸν σκληροτράχηλόν σε εἶναι*), in the context of the future inheritance promised to the Israelites.

In a verbal clause with *λαός* as subject the expected congruent singular usually obtains for the verb, but if the verb is not in the immediate clause itself, it will again appear in the plural. Thus in 8₂₀ *ἐξαπὸστεilon τὸν λαόν μου ἵνα μοι λατρεύσωσιν*, though in 13₁₇ *τῷ λαῷ ἰδόντι πόλεμον καὶ ἀποστρέψῃ εἰς Αἴγυπτον*. There is then no doubt that the popular *αυτον* in 4₂₃ is secondary.

106 *ἄ*] *ο* A M 376'-οI'-82 C''-126 *b d* 246 *n s t x y*-318 122 18 55 59 130 509 646' Bo Syh; *ας* 120^c(vid) 76; *αι* 319; *ην* 64^m_g; *οσην* 318

There was a great deal of uncertainty in the tradition about the proper relative pronoun because there is no actually named antecedent near at hand. Exod presupposes *σημεῖα* of v. 1, whereas the variants are all attempts to fix up the text. The popular variant may well have been palaeographically promoted, i. e. as a dittograph, since the next word (*οὐδέποτε*) begins with *omicron*. It must be wrong, however, since it has no antecedent at all; presumably an understood *σημεῖον* would have to be postulated.

127 *αὐτά*] *αυτο* (*αυτω* 44-610^c) A O-426-15-381' 57 *d* 246 *n*-458 85'-343' *t* 121-527 68' 799 Aeth Arm Sa Syh = **℣**; *αυτ* 458

One should compare v. 6 where the singular does obtain: "The whole multitude of the congregation of the Israelites shall slay it" (*αὐτό*). Here in v. 7, however, the plural is probably original text, and the singular constitutes a corrected reading either based on the Hebrew, or to make it consistent with v. 6. The translator used the plural because the context refers to *οἴκοις* where they ate *αὐτά*. Since the instructions in v. 4 referred to a lamb for each house, the plural was deemed more appropriate here. Note how this use is continued in v. 9 where *ἀπ' αὐτῶν* renders **מֵנֵנוּ**.

187 (*εἰσάγαγεν*) *αὐτόν* B M 426-οI C''-413 127 18 ^{La}cod 104] *intraverunt* Aeth Arab; *αυτους* rell

℣ has **ויבאו** which Aeth and Arab represent, whereas Exod equals Sam **ויבאו** which was probably its parent text. The majority text was influenced by the earlier

context; not just Jethro and Moses are involved, but Moses' wife and two sons had also arrived, and the variant text welcomes them all into the tent. It must be admitted, however, that a "correction" from an original plural to a singular is also plausible, since the immediate context as well as the next verse refers only to Moses and Jethro. The choice of *αὐτόν* was admittedly influenced by the support of Sam, which text is often closer to LXX than *ℳ*, and here seems to have provided the actual parent text.

197 *αὐτῶ* F^a] *αὐτοῖς* (*αὐτους* 799) A F M oI-15-29 C''-414' 19* d 130^{ms} t x y-392 18 46 55 76' 799 Aeth-C Pal

The reference is here to Moses, not to the people as *צוהו* of *ℳ* shows. The popular variant is a scribal error due to the occurrence of *αὐτοῖς* in the main clause (*παρέθηκεν αὐτοῖς*). Moses is throughout the verse the subject except in the relative clause at the end: *οὗς συνέταξεν αὐτῶ ὁ θεός*.

2025 *αὐτό*] *αὐτους* B 72 610*(vid) 53'-56^c-129 = Ra

There is an apparent inconsistency of number in *ℳ* which is followed by Exod. The protasis refers to making an altar of stones, and the apodosis in both *ℳ* and Exod says "you shall not build *them* with cut stones," i.e. the object of "build" is not "altar" as might be expected but the "stones." The verse then goes on to explain *τὸ γὰρ ἐγχειρίδιον ἐπιβέβληκας ἐπ' αὐτὸ καὶ μεμΐανται*. That the reference is no longer to the stones as the careless "correction" of the variant text has it but rather to the altar, is clear from the singular verb *μεμΐανται*.

324 *αὐτά* 1° F^avid] *αὐτο* (*αὐτῶ* 126 59) A F M 376-oI'-707 C''-16 d 56' s-130* t 527 121 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 799 Aeth Arab Arm Bo^B Syh = *ℳ*; *αὐτον* 707 130* 318 — *αὐτά* 2° B F^b 16-131*(vid) n-127 71' 55 426 646] *αὐτῶ* 72 19 318; *αὐτον* 707 108 129 127 126*; *αὐτῶν* 767* 319; *αὐτοῖς* 767^c 53'; *αὐτο* rel = *ℳ*

The reference in both cases is to the materials which the Israelites brought to Aaron and from which he made the golden calf. In both cases *ℳ* has the singular pronoun rather than the expected plural, since the actual reference is to the *נומי הזהב* of v. 3. *ℳ* apparently thought in terms of the *זהב* rather than the *נומי*. But the Greek had *τὰ ἐνώτια τὰ χρυσᾶ* and the reference must be plural. The variant text represents a hebraizing correction which, though it technically equals *ℳ*, does not make good sense and could hardly be original.

327 *οὗς* 908] *ον* B 15'-58-767^c 246 x 392 z ^{Lat}cod 100 Arm; *ος* 106-610; *ο* 767*(vid)

The referent is *ὁ λαός*, and the *οὗς* represents a good example of regular usage in Exod; cf v. 11 as well. If *λαός* follows the word with which it agrees, it is treated as a singular, but if the agreement follows *λαός* the word is treated as plural. Accordingly here *οὗς* is correct since *ὁ λαός σου* precedes it. Note in v. 6 *ἐκάθισεν ὁ λαός . . . καὶ ἀνέστησαν . . .* The singular variant in v. 7 is a hypercorrection putting the pronoun into grammatical rather than semantic agreement with the noun.

3817 *αὐτῆς* 3°] *αὐτων* B 15' 56-129-246* 127* 392 799 Bo Pal = Ra

The pronoun modifies *τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας* and $\mathfrak{M}$ has *ומחתייה*. The verse details three golden things made, all connected with the candelabrum. $\mathfrak{M}$ details these as *גרתיה, מלקחיה* and *מחתייה*, i.e. its lamps, its snuffers and its oil vessels. Exod renders these resp. by *λύχνους ἐπ' αὐτῆς, τὰς λαβίδας αὐτῆς* and *τὰς ἐπαρυστρίδας αὐτῆς*, all quite adequate equivalents. In each case *αὐτῆς* has *λυχνίαν* of v. 13 as antecedent. The change of *αὐτῆς* 3° to *αὐτῶν* in the tradition makes the oil flasks belong either to the snuffers or to the lamps, which is not in accordance with $\mathfrak{M}$ nor is it likely to be the translator's intent.

7. Change in gender of pronouns.

214 *αὐτοῦ* = Sam] *αὐτης* A F M O^{n-381' 707} Cⁿ b 53'-56'^c 130^{ms}-321^{ms} x 121 z 18 46 55 59 76' 426 509 646 Sa Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

The popular variant is probably recensional, whereas Exod is either based on a different parent text such as Sam, or represents an attempt at smoothing out the text. The general context throughout vv. 2—4 has been the legal rights of the bought Hebrew slave at the time of his release from his master. In v. 4 is detailed the situation of such a slave being given a wife by his master, who then bears children. At the time of the release the wife and the children belong to the owner, not to the husband/father. The Exod text makes the reference as “his owner” rather than “her owner,” probably since it is really part of the legal relation between slave and his master, rather than that of master and the slave's wife that is being referred to.

2721 *αὐτό]* *αὐτον* A F M 767-οΙ' Cⁿ 44 n⁻⁷⁵ s t x γ⁻³¹⁸ z 18 46 55 59 426 509 Latcod 100; *αυτην* 106; *αυτ'* 125'

The popular *αὐτον* must refer to the *λύχνος* of the preceding verse in the phrase *καίηται λύχνος*. This is, however, incorrect since the verb is there middle, whereas in v. 21 *καύσει* is transitive and *αὐτό* / *αὐτον* is intended as object. It is not the lamp which Aaron and his sons are to burn but rather the oil. In Exod the antecedent is indeed *ἔλαιον* of v. 20.

3114 *αὐτοῦ* B 15' 55 426 Syh^L] > 509; *αὐτης* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The pronoun occurs in the clause *ἐξολεθρευθήσεται ἡ ψυχὴ ἐκείνη ἐκ μέσου τοῦ λαοῦ αὐτοῦ*, and one's immediate impression is that the B+ reading is a clumsy mistake. The anaphoric reference in *ψυχὴ ἐκείνη*, however, is *πᾶς ὃς ποιήσει ἐν αὐτῷ ἔργον*. The translator apparently had the larger context in mind and made the referent masculine. It is, of course, the *lectio difficilior*, and here indeed it is to be preferred. The popular *αὐτης* is a correction (not necessarily hebraizing), since the pressure towards *αὐτης* is from the immediate context.

3820 *αὐτοῦς]* *αυτας* B 15-707 129 n⁻¹²⁷ 71' 55 = Ra; *αυτα* 19' d 127 t

The neuter is a variant of *αυτας*, involving the dropping of a final *sigma*, which is a fairly common phenomenon in the tradition. The *αυτας* might at first sight seem

attractive in view of the immediate context; the immediately preceding words are *καὶ ἀγκύλας ἐποίησεν ἀργυρᾶς ἐπὶ τῶν στύλων*. One would naturally think that the accusative pronoun (modifying *οὗτος περιηργύρωσεν*) in the next clause would refer to *ἀγκύλας*, i. e. *αὐτάς*. But this would simply repeat what had just been said in the preceding clause, viz. “he made silver *ἀγκύλας* on the pillars;” thus the pronominal reference must be to *στύλων*, i. e. *αὐτούς*.

8. Change in case of pronouns.

98 (λάβετε) ὑμεῖς] ὑμιν (ἡμιν 618) A M oI-29'-135 C" b⁻¹⁹ d s⁻³⁴³ t y 18 59 424 646 Aeth Arab Bo = 𐤀𐤋

The nominative is probably to be preferred, although at 12₂₁ which is an exact parallel Exod has *λάβετε ὑμῖν ἐαυτοῖς*. On the other hand, 34₁₁ has *πρόσεχε σύ* for *ἄρα ἦ*. For the nominative second personal pronoun following an imperative only the following further examples occur in Exod: 19₂₄ 24₁ *ἀνάβηθι σὺ καὶ Ἀαρὼν*; 33₁ *ἀνάβηθι . . . σὺ καὶ ὁ λαός*; 11₈ *ἔξελθε σὺ καὶ πᾶς ὁ λαός*, and 18₁₉ *γίνου σύ*. But in all these examples 𐤀𐤋 has *𐤏𐤍𐤁*. Only 34₁₁ *πρόσεχε σύ* gives a real parallel. For a good parallel outside Exod cf Deut 4₂₃ *προσέχετε ὑμεῖς*.

228 *αὐτός*] *αὐτον* B* 126 = Compl

Normally the subject of the infinitive is in the accusative and the B* 126 reading is an easy variant. It should also be noted that in v. 11 the immediate context *ἦ μὴν μὴ αὐτὸν πεπονηρεῦσθαι* is exactly the same. In this verse the main verb is *ὀμεῖται* and its subject and that of the infinitive are the same, viz. *ὁ κύριος τῆς οἰκίας*, and the normal pattern in such cases would be to omit a pronominal subject for the infinitive. There is, however, potential confusion. Theoretically the *ὁ κλέψας* might be thought of as subject, or even worse, *τοῦ θεοῦ*, and Exod to make certain that no confusion might exist uses *αὐτός* to emphasize the identity of the subject as the same as that of *ὀμεῖται*. For this he chose the possible though more unusual *αὐτός*; cf Blass-Debrunner 405.

3235 *ὅν*] *ον* B O^{-767-15' 73'-550'} f z 55 799 = Ra

Exod is usually quite careful about grammatical congruity for relative pronouns, and in *ὃν ἐποίησεν Ἀαρὼν* the pronoun should be accusative since it modifies as direct object the verb *ἐποίησεν*. Admittedly, one might think it possible that confusion might exist as to the referent. At least in theory both *λαόν* and *μόσχον* would be possible, both being masculine singular. But no one could possibly think that *λαόν* was meant. The variant arose quite naturally by attraction to the case of the referent which immediately preceded it, viz. *μόσχου*.

341 *ἃς*] *αις* B O^{-376-29 b 106-107' 56' s⁻⁷³⁰ t 121' 128'-407-628 55 509 799}

The translator tends to grammatical correctness with respect to the use of relative pronouns, rather than assimilating them to the inflection of the antecedent, though

the latter phenomenon does occasionally occur. Here there is good solid support for ἄς which as object of συνέτριψας should be accusative rather than the dative of its antecedent, πλαξίν. The dative is thus a secondary attraction, and was probably also influenced by the syllable immediately preceding it (πρώταις).

3430 αὐτῶ] αὐτου B 82 53'-56* 392* 55 509 799 = Ra

The verb ἐγγίζω in the sense of "approach, come near" is normally modified either by a dative or a πρὸς construction, whereas a genitive though not impossible is highly unusual. ℞ has לִי. The forms αὐτῶ and αὐτοῦ were easily confused by scribes and the weakly attested αὐτου is simply a scribal error.

4017 (ἐπ') αὐτήν] αὐτης B 44 53*-246* 68'-120' 646 = Ra; αὐτοις 53^c-246^c-664

The preposition ἐπὶ can govern the genitive, dative or the accusative, but for Exod the accusative is the most common. Including the above instance the accusative occurs 180 times, the genitive 110 times, and the dative only 19 times. But of more importance is usage when the prepositional phrase modifies the verb ἐπιτίθημι. The dative never occurs, the genitive four times, and the accusative 33 times. Obviously the accusative is here to be preferred.

9. Change in person of the pronoun occurs occasionally.

829 σου 2°] φαραω M O''-64^{mg} (72) 82 C'' 118'-537 d n s-321^{mg} t 121' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth
Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh = ℞
— σου 1°] αὐτου M O''-64^{mg} (72) 82 C'' 118'-537 d n-458 s t 121' 18 55 59 509 646 Aeth-C
Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh = ℞
— σου 2°] αὐτου M O(-72)-15-707 d n-628 t 18 646 Arm Bo Pal Syh = ℞

℞ begins the verse with direct address to Pharaoh on the part of Moses, but then changes in midstream to a third person address. This Exod characteristically renders consistently by making the entire verse in second person. The variants in all three cases are hebraizing corrections; note how O and the Byzantine tradition consistently support the "corrected" text, illustrating thereby the probably secondary nature of their text.

1413 ὑμῖν O-376 78-413 127 s-321 Arm Sa] > 107'-125 59 Bo^B; ημιν rell = Ra

Whenever variants obtain between first and second plural pronouns they are almost invariably simply itacistic, and a glance at the Hebrew will determine which is original since visual or auditory confusion can hardly obtain in the Hebrew. Here ℞ has לָכֵם. Nor is there anything in the context to promote a first person reference. The popular reading is simply wrong.

10. Change of pronominal stem.

1014 μετ' αὐτήν] μετα ταυτα B 376^c 52*(vid) 56-129 x 120-128' 130 799 = Ra; μετα ταυτην 15-58'-376*-707 C''-52* (126) b d 246^c 628 t y-527 68' 55 59 76' 509 Arm Pal

What does seem clear is that the Ra text cannot be original. The phrase *μετὰ ταῦτα* always occurs in Exod simply as an indefinite “afterwards” (320 51 1118 1314 3432). Here it contrasts with *προτέρᾳ αὐτῆς*, and *μετ’ αὐτήν* is the expected reading, though the popular reading *μετα ταυτην* would also be appropriate. The A + reading has been chosen, however, as stylistically the better reading, with the popular reading simply a palaeographically inspired variant. The B reading is then to be understood as *ex par*, i.e. under the influence of a common LXX phrase.

2023 *ἐαυτοῖς* 2°] *αυτοις* (*αυτους* 134) A M O⁻³⁷⁶ C^{''-57'} 118'-537 107' 56'-129 85'-130-343' t
x 121-392 z 55 59 76' 424 426 = Ra
1221 (*ὁμῖν*) *ἐαυτοῖς*] *αυτοις* A M O⁻³⁷⁶ 29-82-135 d⁻¹⁰⁶ fⁿ⁻¹²⁷ s t^{-134txt} γ⁻⁵²⁷ z 18 59 76' 130
3032 (*ὁμῖν*) *ἐαυτοῖς*] *αυτοις* 72-707-707^l 500 53'-56 527 509 799
3037 (*ὁμῖν*) *ἐαυτοῖς*] *αυτοις* B F^b O⁻³⁷⁶ 707-707^l 500* 129 n 527 55 = Ra

The use of the reflexive pronoun after the second person personal pronoun is highly unusual, but it does occur in the LXX; cf e.g. Deut 423. The classical usage is *αὐτοῖς*, and this remained “correct” in Hellenistic Greek as well. The reflexive pronoun can and often does substitute for second or first person personal pronouns, especially in the dative, in Hellenistic Greek, and does occur occasionally in LXX. Though its use, as far as I have been able to discover, is limited to the LXX in extant literature, support for it is consistently too strong to declare it unacceptable; admittedly, it is the *lectio difficilior*, and the urge for copyists to change it to the more acceptable *αυτ*-stem must have been almost irresistible. Particularly strong is the case of 3032 where the evidence for *ὁμῖν ἐαυτοῖς* is overwhelming; were it completely unacceptable usage, it is difficult to understand the pattern of support for it in the tradition. In all the above cases the *lectio difficilior* is to be preferred.

2110 *αὐτῶ*] *εαυτω* B^c 82 b f^{-56*} 68'-120' 424 = Ra; > B* 509 Bo^B

Exod does not normally use the reflexive dative pronoun in the singular, even though the referent is clearly the same as the subject. In fact there are only three cases: 414 *χαρήσεται ἐν ἐαυτῷ*; 620 *ἔλαβεν . . . ἐαυτῷ εἰς γυναῖκα*, and 1618 *ἕκαστος εἰς τοὺς καθήκοντας παρ' ἐαυτῷ*. In each case there is a good exegetical or stylistic reason for the reflexive. It should also be noted that the support in the mss is very weak; with B* having omitted it there is no early evidence for it, and *αὐτῶ* is almost certainly original.

2216 *αὐτῶ*] *εαυτω* F M O^{''-72} C^{''} b d⁻⁴⁴ f⁻¹²⁹ n 30'-85-343' t x y z 18 46 55 59 76' 424 426
509 646' Lat^{cod} 103

The majority readings at first blush might seem to be original, since its referent is clearly the same as the subject of the verb *φερνιεῖ* and a reflexive pronoun would certainly fit in the context. Since Exod only sparsely used the dative singular reflexive pronoun unless there is a good exegetical reason for it, it should here be rejected since the more common *αὐτῶ* here admits of no misunderstanding. Furthermore a change to the reflexive is easy to envisage for copyists; the reverse would be almost incomprehensible.

3114 $\delta\varsigma$ B O⁻²⁹ 129 $n x z$ 55] o 426; $\sigma\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ rell

That $\delta\varsigma$ is original rather than $\sigma\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ is clear when one examines Exod usage. Exod never uses the indefinite pronoun after $\pi\alpha\varsigma$; in fact, $\delta\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ occurs only once and that in the opening statement of the Decalogue, 20:1. Actually the relative adjective $\delta\sigma\alpha$ is the form used by Exod for the accusative after $\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$ throughout instead of $\delta\nu$; cf Bauer sub $\delta\sigma\sigma\varsigma$. Cf also v. 15.

3317 ($\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\pi\iota\acute{\omicron}\nu$) μου] $\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon$ A F oI-707 C⁻¹⁶ 77-57 ς -30 527 121' 126-128'-628 59 646

The enclitic form is to be preferred. Admittedly, the phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\pi\iota\acute{\omicron}\nu$ μου occurs only four times in Exod (also in 23:15 32:33 34:20). At 23:15 only ms 527 has the long form; at 32:33 only B^(c) 58^c-oII-29 53'-56 n 527 426 799 have $\epsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon$, and at 34:20 only the enclitic form is found in the mss. In no case has the accented form won a following in the majority of witnesses, and it is clear that Exod always used the enclitic form after $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omega\pi\iota\omicron\nu$.

3640 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ τό A B 15 52-615^c-761 $d f n t$ 55 426] om τό 707* 392; $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$ 537 Aeth; $\epsilon\pi$ $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron$ (aut $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omega$) rell = Ra $\mathfrak{W}$

The phrase $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$ τό $\lambda\omega\mu\alpha$ is Exod's realization of עליו , and the change of τό to $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron$ is a hexaplaric correction. The Hebrew then follows with פֶּתִיל תְּכֵלֶת "a blue thread." In Ra's text the $\lambda\omega\mu\alpha$ must represent פֶּתִיל "thread of cord," but this is highly unlikely. The word $\lambda\omega\mu\alpha$ is the rendering for שׁוּל "hem or border," not for פֶּתִיל which is omitted entirely by Exod. The $\lambda\omega\mu\alpha$ must be the border of the πέταλον on which a blue (i.e. cord) was placed so that it might be firmly laid upon the top part of the turban.

H. Nouns.

1. The spelling of $\theta\eta\mu\omega\nu\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ $\theta\eta\mu\omega\nu\iota\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ at 8:14 is with an *eta* rather than with *iota* which Ra adopted on the basis of B, and it is clearly correct as LS (cf also Wa 289) shows. It derives from the root $\sqrt{\theta\eta}$ as in τίθημι and must be spelled with *eta*. The spellings $\theta\mu\omega\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (as B F^b 970+) or $\theta\epsilon\mu\omega\nu\iota\alpha\varsigma$ (as A F+) are itacistic.

816 $\sigma\kappa\nu\iota\phi\epsilon\varsigma$ 970] $\sigma\kappa\nu\iota\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ (cvar) O-376*-15-135 C["] 44 f -129* 75' 84^c x 318-527 z 55^c 59 76' 424 646 Syh^{Tmg}. Similarly at 8:17 $\sigma\kappa\nu\iota\phi\epsilon\varsigma$ 1° 2°; 8:18 $\sigma\kappa\nu\iota\phi\alpha$ and $\sigma\kappa\nu\iota\phi\epsilon\varsigma$.

There is confusion already in the third century B.C. in Egypt as to whether the aspirated or the unaspirated labio-dental is proper for this word (cf Mayser I.1.146; cf also Thack 7.18). Since all the uncials in the five instances above (all the instances in which the word occurs in Exod) spell the word with *phi*, that spelling has been followed throughout. Cf, however, Ps 104:31 where according to Rahlfs *Psalmi cum Odis* A*(vid) B have $\sigma\kappa\nu\iota\pi\epsilon\varsigma$ whereas A^c S have $\sigma\kappa\nu\iota\phi\epsilon\varsigma$ (only citing uncial texts).

159 $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$] $-\rho\eta$ A B* F 82 56-129 30-344^{txt} 121' 509 = Ra

1713 $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha\varsigma$] $-\rho\eta\varsigma$ B

2224 $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ omnes

821 κυνομυίας] -μυιης B 58-426-707 56'-129 55* = Ra

824 κυνομυίας] -μυιης B 82' = Ra

The classical retention of $\bar{\alpha}$ after ϱ , ε , ι in the singular for first declension feminine nouns is sometimes voided in later Greek. The earliest attested cases of $-\varrho\eta\varsigma$ or $-\eta\eta$ as well as of $-\nu\eta\varsigma$ are found in the Tebtunis Papyri (second to first centuries B.C.); cf Mayser I 1.11. Were Ra correct at 15⁹ and 821²⁴, these would be the earliest attested forms. It is far more likely that these forms betray later changes in the tradition. Codex B cannot be trusted not to have taken on later forms, and it would be unwise to adopt its readings. It might also be noted that Ra did not adopt B's reading at 1713, nor did he emend to $\mu\alpha\chi\alpha\iota\eta$ at 2224. Cf also Thack 140f which statement is based only on uncial texts.

279 $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$] $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ B 82 $f n^{-127}$ 55 799 = Ra

2711 $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$] $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ B 82 f^{-129} 392 55 799 = Ra

2712 $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$] $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ B 82 392 55 = Ra

2715 $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$] $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ B F 82 f^{-129} 392 55 76' 799 = Ra

2716 $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$] $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ B 82 f^{-129} 392 55 799 = Ra

2718 $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$] $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ B F 15'-29-64* $d^{(-106)}$ f^{-129} t 392 55 59 76' 509 799 = Ra

372 $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$ 2°] $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ B 29-82 $d^{(-44)}$ 246* n^{-127} t 46 319 426 509 = Ra

Ra's choice of the contracted Hellenistic forms of the genitive plural of $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\upsilon\varsigma$ in these scattered references is puzzling, since in all other instances throughout the book he chooses the classical forms. It is highly doubtful that a translator would proceed in so chaotic a fashion. In fact even in ch. 27 Ra follows the classical form three times in v. 1 as well as using it in vv. 13 14. For other instances cf 25⁹ 16 22 262 twice 8 twice 16 302 372 10 11 twice 13 16 twice. The classical form has been adopted throughout. Not only is it the dominant form in the tradition, but for the third century B.C. literary materials doubtful cases should be decided in favor of the more conservative classical forms. For $\pi\acute{\eta}\chi\epsilon\omega\nu$ vs $\pi\eta\chi\omega\nu$ cf Thack 151.

2. Change in number of nouns.

919 (έν) τοῖς πεδίοις] τῷ πεδίῳ A B 15-376' Aeth Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh = Ra

921 (έν) τῷ πεδίῳ] τοῖς πεδίοις B 58'-82' $b f n s^{-321mg}$ x 392-527 120-128' 130 799 Lat^{cod} 104 = Ra

In spite of the oldest witnesses supporting the singular in v. 19, it is unlikely to be original but is rather due to the influence of $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\ \pi\epsilon\delta\acute{\iota}\omega$ occurring in the preceding clause. $\mathfrak{M}$ has בשדה for both, but that is not relevant. The translator used the plural because the reference to $\text{οἱ ἄνθρωποι καὶ τὰ κτήνη}$ is plural. In the preceding clause it is singular because the reference is to σοι . The plural is indeed the more unusual and is to be preferred.

This is not the case in v. 21 where Ra did adopt the plural. There the plural is not nearly so attractive since the reference, $\delta\varsigma\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \mu\eta\ \pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\chi\epsilon\nu$, is again singular. The plural variant may well be due to the influence of τοῖς πεδίοις in v. 19b, or possibly to τὰ κτήνη preceding it, but it is not original text.

1315 πρωτοτόκων 1° B 82' 14-126 *bfn s*⁻⁷³⁰ x 318' 128'-628 130 Sa] -τοκου rell
 — πρωτοτόκων 2° B 82 126 *bfn* 85'-343' x 318' 128'-628 Arm^{te} Sa] -τοκου rell

ℳ has בְּכָוֶה (בכ(ו)) which was understood as a collective by the translator. The plural was used because the genitive modifiers are in the plural (ἀνθρώπων, κτηνῶν). The singular variant is probably ex par.

2228 ἄρχοντας B 15'-376 30-85-343'-730^c x 527 Arm^{ap} Sa Syh] ἀρχοντ^r 458; ἀρχοντα rell = ℳ

Exod chose to understand נָשִׂיא as a collective noun, since נָשִׂיא in Exodus occurs elsewhere in the plural (1622 3431 3527) as chieftains. The singular may well be a hebraizing correction which eventually became the popular text.

246 κρατήρας B 15-58' Phil III 42 Aeth^{FHM} Arm Sa Syh] -τηρα rell

The pattern of support for Exod might well suggest that κρατήρας was a hebraizing correction towards אֲגִנֹת of ℳ, the support including ms support from hex mss as well as Arm and Syh. But it is also supported by Phil which is hardly hex, and this support together with cod B does make it attractive as candidate for original text. This would mean that Origen did not “change” the text but rather took the text that he had before him, since he, according to his own statement, only “added” when the Hebrew text had no equivalent in his Greek. It is clear that he did more in his rearranging the word order to fit the Hebrew order as well as at times “correcting” transliterations, but actually changing Greek words to fit the Hebrew he is not supposed to have done. The popular singular text was probably simply a scribal error in origin, i. e. a loss of the final consonant *sigma*.

2523 στρεπτά (+ επτα 799) κυμάτια χρυσᾶ B Fa 82' 57'^{ms}-550'^{ms} f 30'-85'^{ms}-130^{ms} x γ⁻³¹⁸ 799] κυμ. στρ. χρ. 55; κυμ. στρ. 767 n; uersatilia cybatia^{Lat} codd 91 94—96 102; στρεπτον κυματιον b Aeth^C; (cvar) στρεπτον κυματιον χρυσουν rell

Both here and in v. 10 the phrase appears in the plural, but in v. 24 it is singular. For both the ark and the table there are moldings because there are four sides. For v. 24 the molding is for the στεφάνη, and the translator considered this to be singular, although the border or rim is also viewed as being for the entire table. The popular singular variant in v. 23 is then the result of the influence of the singular in v. 24.

3114 τὰ σάββατα B 15' 129 55 426^{Lat} cod 100 Arm] + mea Sa; το σαββατον (+ meum Aeth Bo) 908 rell

The question of whether שַׁבָּת should be rendered by the singular or the plural is a complicated one. In my opinion Exod rendered it consistently by the plural but often treated it as a grammatical singular except at 3116 where αὐτά refers to σάββατα, i. e. the plural. Often it appears unarticulated but by no means with any regularity. The word appears 12 times in Exod, two of which are in the genitive modifying the word ἡμέρα (208 353). In three cases σάββατα obtains in all mss (1623 3113 16). The evidence for the singular in the remainder is as follows.

- 1625 σαββατον *f*-¹²⁹ 646 Sa Syh
 1626 σαββατον *F*^b 72
 1629 το σαββατον *F*^b 15-58 Arm Sa
 2010 σαββατον *F*^b 610 Aeth Arm Sa
 3115 σαββατον 72-707¹ 739 75 426 Aeth Arm Sa
 352 σάββατα B *F*^a M^{ms} 15-707-767 *d f*-¹²⁹ *n t* 527 318' 68'-120' 55* 416^c 426 799 Lat^{cod}
 100] σαββατον rell

Outside of 3114 and 352 the evidence is overwhelmingly for *σάββατα*, and in view of that fact it would seem judicious to accept the plural form for these two passages as well.

That (τὰ) *σάββατα* is usually understood as a singular seems to be the case almost consistently. At 1623 3115 it is defined as *ἀνάπανσις ἀγία*; it is commonly referred to as a day (1626 29 208 10 3115 353), as *σήμερον* at 1625, as *κατάπανσις*, *ἅγιον*, *ἀνάπανσις* at 352, as a *σημεῖον* in 3113, and in v. 14 it is said *ὅτι ἅγιον τοῦτό*.

- 339 τῶν θυρῶν] *την θυραν* B 15'-376 73'-550' *f* 392 126 55 799 Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth Sa = Ra; *της θυρας* 426
 3310 τῶν θυρῶν] *της θυρας* B 82' 129 426 = Ra; *την* (> 246*) *θυραν* 15 73'-550' *f*-¹²⁹ 527 799; *ianuat* Lat^{cod} 100; *τας θυρας* 407 55 509

The above nouns are governed by *ἐπί*. The notion "at the door (of the tent)" occurs quite often throughout the book. Though the Hebrew is usually simply פתח (i. e. in the singular; in fact the plural does not occur in Exodus), there is no consistency of number whatsoever in Exod, and only the tradition can decide. Here, however, there is a built-in contrast. In the above cases the pillar of the cloud was standing *ἐπὶ τῶν θυρῶν τῆς σκηנῆς*, and the reference is clearly to the "tent of witness." The text goes on to say that all the people were standing and bowed down *ἐκαστος ἀπὸ τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηנῆς αὐτοῦ*. In other words the translator contrasts the "doors" of the tabernacle with the "door" of the individual tents of the Israelites, and the plural seems to be intentional in the above cases.

- 3611 συμπελεγμένον (συνπ. A M 509) A M^{xt} *oI*-29 56' *t x* 318' 128'-628 18 46 59 319 416 509 799] *-γμεν* 126; *-νας d* 55; *-μενα* (cvar) rell

The antecedent must be *ἐργον ὕφαντόν*; that is what is plaited. The popular variant resulted from attraction to the inflection of the intervening prepositional phrase *εἰς ἄλληλα*. But the participle can hardly modify *ἄλληλα* since this would make very little sense. The Hebrew text is of no help here and the translator simply tried to make a plausible description.

- 388 σκιάζοντας] (+ *και* 72) *σκιαζοντα* (σνσκιαζ. 72 75 68'-120) A B 15'-72-381' 500 *b f*-²⁴⁶ 75' *x y*-³¹⁸ 68'-120' 18 55 426 799 = Ra

The popular variant is not to be analyzed as a neuter plural but rather as a masculine accusative singular. Since v. 7 refers to the cherubs individually, i. e. twice as *χερουβ ἕνα*, this would be the antecedent; the singular then entered the tradition by attraction to *χερουβ*. But this must be the result of a thoughtless mistake. מַחֲיִי וַיְהִי כַנָּפִים הַכְרַבִּים which leaves no room for any doubt that the reference must be plural, i. e. the antecedent is the *δύο χερουβὶμ χερουσούς* of v. 6. Furthermore the singu-

lar is senseless in the context of Exod; the participle is modified by *ταῖς πτέρουσιν αὐτῶν* (with only ms 500* omitting *αὐτῶν*).

38¹⁸ *τοῖς στύλοις*] *τῷ στυλῷ* (-λλω 619) B 15 19' 71' 55 426 Pal = Ra

The origin of the singular variant is difficult to explain. It simply does not fit into the context. All the objects in the verse are in the plural: *τοὺς στύλους, τοῖς στύλοις, τοὺς μοχλοὺς, τοὺς στύλους* and *τὰς ἀγκύλας*, and though this one alone is in the dative, the plural is demanded by the sense of the passage. The variant is probably simply a careless mistake.

3. Change in case of nouns.

514 *λέγοντες*] *λεγοντων* F M O'-72*-29 C" 118'-537 *d*⁻⁶¹⁰ *n s t*⁻¹³⁴ 121' 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 646

λέγων / *λέγοντες* like the *לֹא־מַרְמֵר* which it translates is treated like an indeclinable as far as case is concerned in Exod, the only exception being the rather difficult *λέγοντας* of 17₇. As a nominative its antecedent should grammatically be the word *κατασταθέντες* (in turn in apposition to *οἱ γραμματεῖς . . . τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*), rather than the *ἐπιστατῶν* of Pharaoh. In actual fact, however, it is the *ἐπιστατῶν* who are making the demands, and the "correction" of the text to the genitive makes that clear. Were the genitive original, it would be difficult to understand why a scribe or reviser would introduce a nominative which might promote a false understanding of the text. Only the usual nominative can be the original text here.

At 17₇ *λέγοντας* rather than the *λεγοντες* of 29 *b*⁻³¹⁴ *d* 53' 127 85-730 *t* 318' 120-628 509 799 is original. The use of the nominative might make the reader think that it is Moses who is speaking. The use of the accusative here shows real understanding, since it modifies the unexpressed subject of the infinitive *πειράζειν* (verbalized by Origen in the asterisked plus *αυτους*).

121 *Αἰγύπτῳ*] *αιγυπτου* B O⁻⁴²⁶-15-29* 126 537 56*-246 127 85-321¹²¹-343' 392-527 120 130 509 = Ra

The translator throughout Exodus always renders *בְּאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם* by *ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτῳ*, never by *ἐν γῇ αιγυπτου* (628 73 115 9 10 12₁₂ twice 13 29 40 13₁₅ 14₁₁ 163 22₂₁ 239). On the other hand, when the word *πάσῃ* obtains between *ἐν* and *γῇ*, Egypt always follows in the genitive, i. e. as *ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου* (7_{19 21} 8_{16 17} 9_{9 11 25} 10_{15 19} 12₃₀). One can be certain that *Αἰγύπτῳ* must therefore be read at 12₁ in accordance with this translation pattern.

12₁₁ *κυρίῳ* B 82 118'-537 129 628 85 509 Syh] *κυριου* rel

Although *κυρίῳ* is only supported by a few scattered witnesses it is obviously original. Even though the Hebrew pattern *ל הוּא* or *ל יהיה* could equally well be rendered by *εἶναι* plus the dative or the genitive, the genitive is only attested once in Exod, and even there the dative occurs as a variant: 4₁₆ (*ἔσται σου*] *σοι* 15'-618 C" 628 55^c Ach Aeth Arab Arm^{te} Pal Sa Syh; *𐤌* has *לך יהיה*).

On the other hand, the dative is frequently attested, especially with pronouns. For *κυρίῳ* the following obtain: 12⁴² 29²⁵ 30¹⁰ and in the sense of a human *κυρίῳ*, 21⁴.

23¹⁶ ἐξόδου B M 82'-376-381' 126 *d f*-56* 458 *s t x* 527 *z*-630 18 46 76' 426 509] ἐξόδων 767;
ἐξοδω *rell*

The phrase *בצאת השנה* of *ℳ* is rendered by Exod as *ἐπ' ἐξόδου τοῦ ἐνιαυτοῦ*. Four mss, 58' 56* 799, have *εν* for *ἐπ'* as well. The preposition *ἐπί* used in a temporal sense is best served by the genitive, whereas the dative is late and considered to be rather bad Greek according to LS. In a third century B. C. document one would certainly expect the genitive and Ra was fully justified in following B here.

25¹² ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων] ξύλα ασηπτα B M^{txt} 82' 118'-537 56* *n* 85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343-344^{txt} 392
126 18 46 55 799 = Ra; + ξύλα ασηπτα *f*-56*

The term *עצי שמים* occurs a number of times to signify the material out of which something was (to be) made and in such contexts whenever it is rendered (it is not rendered in 36²⁰ 31 37¹ 4 10 15 25 28 38¹ 6) it is always translated by *ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων*, and never by the accusative of material *ξύλα ασηπτα*. The latter phrase does occur in 25⁵ 35⁷ 24 but as direct object or subject of the verb. For *ἐκ ξύλων ἀσήπτων* cf 25²⁷ 26¹⁵ 26 27¹ 6 30¹⁵. At 25²² the phrase is not rendered by Exod.

28²¹ ἑκαστος B 82'-767 129 55 Arm Bo] *εκαστου* *rell*

It might at first glance seem that the genitive should be taken as original text of Exod, since it is grammatically congruent to its context, i. e. *γλυφαὶ σφραγίδων εκαστου κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα*; it is, however, secondary. Whenever *ἑκαστος* obtains as a substantive, i. e. as equivalent for the Hebrew *שׂא*, it is always nominative masculine (24 times). In fact it occurs as an adjective only three times in the accusative and never in the dative or the genitive. The popular variant is simply a stylistic correction of the original text.

37³ (ἔργον) ὑφαντόν] ὑφαντου B M^{ms} O-767-707 19' *d* 56-129-246^c *n* 130^{ms} 84-134 *x* 318'
126-128'-628 55* 59 319 426 Syh = Ra *ℳ*

The text of *ℳ* has *חשב* as the free element in the bound phrase *מעשה חשב*. This occurs eight times in Exodus (26¹ 31 28⁶ 15 36⁸ 35 39³ 8). At 26¹ *ὑφάντου* occurs but it modifies *ἐργασία*. A genitive does obtain in modification of *ἔργον* at 28¹⁵ but the word is *ποικιλοῦ*. At 28⁶ both the adjective and the genitive noun are present, viz. *ἔργον ὑφαντὸν ποικιλοῦ*. At 36⁸ the phrase is not rendered, and in the remaining instances it is always *ἔργον ὑφαντόν*. It is thus quite likely that *ὑφαντόν* is here also original text, and the genitive noun is a hebraizing correction in the tradition.

The phrase also obtains in Exod for other collocations. Thus the adjectival phrase (*ἔργον ὑφαντόν*) occurs at 36¹¹ for *וחשב*, and at 36³⁰ 35 for *מעשה ארג*. The only case where the Hebrew participle is actually rendered by the noun is at 28²⁸ where *מעשה ארג* also obtains but is correctly rendered by *ἔργον ὑφάντου* (-ντον in 376 619 318

509 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96 100). In view of the translator's preference for the adjective phrase it would also seem prudent to adopt it at 37^s for the phrase ^{מַעֲשֵׂה רַקִּים}:

37^s (ἔργον) ὑφαντόν] ὑφαντου A M^{ms} G-767-οII⁻⁷⁰⁷ d 53-56 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ s^{-30'} t⁻⁸⁴ x y 46 55 59
319 426 509^c 799 Syh = Ra

37⁶ αἱ βάσεις αὐτῶν πέντε χαλκαῖ] τας β. α. π. χαλκας (-και 343-344^c-730) A M' οI-29-82 C'' d
53-56' s t y 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 799

The variant text which has the phrase in the accusative is due to the list of accusative phrases preceding it in the verse but it cannot be original; in fact it makes an impossible text, since the verb *κατεχύρσωσαν* intervened; this would make *τας βασεις . . . χαλκας* lexically absurd.

3820 τῇ πύλῃ] την πυλην B 15 129 71' 68'-120' 55 = Ra; της πυλης F^a 707 19' d 127 t 527 318
426 509

Gooding (40) is quite right in rejecting the accusative here; it simply does not make sense. Either the dative or the genitive would fit the context, but the dative alone fits as original from which the other two variants were formed. The addition of a *nu* or a *sigma* to a vocalic ending is a common scribal error. Furthermore the genitive is an easy error since *τῆς θύρας τῆς σκηνης* occurs just before *καὶ τῇ πύλῃ* and might have influenced a scribe.

39⁶ τῶν στόλων] τοις (της 458) στυλοις (cvar) B O'-29 C'' 19' 129 n 85^{txt}-130^{ms}-321^{ms}-343'
71' 55 426^c Aeth^C Arab Arm = Ra

The variant reading is the more literalistic rendering of ^{לַעֲמֻדִים}, whereas Exod is a freer, more idiomatic one. It seems likely that the variant text is a hebraizing correction, an early attempt, possibly prehexaplaric (and adopted by Origen), to make the Greek fit somewhat more closely to the Hebrew.

4. Change in gender.

One case of change in gender might be noted. At 12⁴⁴ *πάν* is supported only by B* 82' 56-129, all others having *παντα*. The word modifies *οἰκέτην* and the use of *πάν* might seem strange. The use of the neuter for the masculine accusative is, however, well attested; cf Thack 174 f, Mayser I 2.32 and Gignac II 134. The *lectio difficilior* is to be preferred here.

I. *Numbers*. Occasionally the tradition has created confusion in numbers; this was probably accelerated through the scribal custom of using abbreviations.

620 ⁸⁵ A b d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ 628 t x 527 55 799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Sa] δυο B f⁻²⁴⁶ = Ra; tres Ach; *quinque* Arm^{ap}; > 135 Aeth^P; *επτα* rell = ⁸⁵ Tar

The reading is part of the number of the years of Amram's life, i.e. 136 years, all witnesses agreeing on the 130. Why Ra should have taken the reading of B, i.e. "two," for his text, is puzzling. It has no more claim to serious consideration than

the readings of Ach (3), Arm^{ap} (5), or of the zero of 135 Aeth^P. The only serious candidates for the original text are *six* or *seven*, the former being the reading of Sam and the popular „seven” that of **Ⲅ**. The former is probably preferable with *επτα* constituting the hebraizing correction, since a correction based on a revision dependent on Sam is not plausible. The parent text of Exod must have read **ϣϣ**.

27¹⁵ πέντε καὶ δέκα] δεκα (+ και 58) πεντε B 58-οΙ' C''(-78) *d f t*-84 *y*-527 *z*-(-126) 59 426 509 799 = Ra

Exod throughout used *πέντε καὶ δέκα* rather than *δεκα πεντε*; cf also v. 14 and 37¹¹ 13, but *δέκα ἕξ* at 26²⁵. On the other hand, *ἐνδεκα* 26⁷ 8 and *δώδεκα* at 28²¹ (twice) are used. It should be noted that at 28²¹ codex B reads *δεκα δυο*.

δώδεκα 1°] *δεκα δυο* B 82 129; *ιβ* 72-376 25-73'-77-313-550' 107' 75 126-407

δώδεκα 2°] *δεκα δυο* B; *ιβ* 72-376 77-551 44-107' 664 75' 126'-630

For the forms of numbers 11 through 19 cf Thack 187 f.

30²³ (διακοσίους) πενήκοντα 1°] *pr και* A M 58-οΙ'-707 707¹ C'' *b*-19 106(c) 56' *s t y* 18 46 59 509 646'

— (διακοσίους) πενήκοντα 2°] *pr και* A(c) M 58-οΙ'-707 707¹ C''(-14 761) 56 85-130-321'-344(mg)-730 *t y*-(-318) 46 55 59 509 646'

The normal pattern followed by Exod for compound numbers is the classical one of orders in a descending scale, except for the lowest order. For the last-named only the following obtain: 26² 8-*καὶ*-20; 37² 8-*καὶ*-20, and 39¹ 9-*καὶ*-20, i.e. the smallest unit precedes the tens and they are joined by a *καί*.

When hundreds or thousands are involved the descending order is followed without a *και* joining the ranks. The presence or absence of *και* as connector between ranks is compounded by the common use of abbreviations in the mss in which case the use of *και* would be highly unusual.

In general, B does not use *και*, whereas A often does. When they agree it is always in favor of the shorter text. In fact in a few instances *και* is completely lacking in the tradition. Since the use of *και* seems on the whole to be later than its absence, the choice of critical text has in the above cases been based on the oldest witness which Ra also followed.

In the last section of the book the pattern differs from the above. Compound numbers occur only in ch. 39 where the following cases are relevant.

v. 1 (ἐπτακόσιοι) καὶ τριάκοντα] *εικοσι* B 15 527 126 55 799 = Ra; *και εικοσι* 56' *z*-126 426; *om και d*-44 127

v. 2 καὶ ἐπτακόσιοι] *om και* B F F^h οΙ'-29-82-707* 16 118'-537 *d f* 343(mg) *x* 318' *z* 46 55 59 319 799 Aeth^R = Ra

v. 2 καὶ ἐβδόμηκοντα] *om και* B F F^h 15'-72-381' 78 19 *d f* 343(mg) 84 *x* 121 68'-120'-126 55 799 Aeth^R = Ra

v. 3 καὶ τρισχιλίους] *om και* 799

v. 3 καὶ πεντακοσίους] *om και* B *d* 129-246 71' 68'-120' 55 426 799 = Ra

v. 3 καὶ πενήκοντα] *om και* 707 *d*-106 *f x* 68'-120' 55 319 426 799

v. 6 καὶ (ἐπτακοσίους) A 58-376-767 19' *n*-127 121 Aeth^C Arab Arm Bo Syh] > *rell* = Ra

v. 6 καὶ (ἐβδόμηκοντα) A 58-376-767 19' *n*-127 *t*-84 121 Aeth^C Arab Arm Syh] > *rell* = Ra

v.7 καὶ (τετρακόσιοι)] > B 72-82' C'-25 422-552 19'-537 d-106 f-129 127 x 68'-120'-126 55 59 426 509 799 = Ra

In each of the above cases the καὶ in compound numbers seems original in contrast to usage in Exod chh. 1—34. The loss of the καὶ in the tradition was of course facilitated by the use of abbreviations; e.g. in v.2 for χίλιοι καὶ ἑπτακόσιοι καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα mss 107'-125 126 read $\overline{\alpha\psi\theta}$, and in v.1 for ἑπτακόσιοι καὶ τριάκοντα mss 107'-125 127 read the abbreviation $\overline{\psi\lambda}$ (and ms 126 has $\overline{\psi\kappa}$).

In v.1 the tradition has produced another error in reading εικοσι for τριάκοντα, an error which Ra adopted. It is, however, merely a scribal mistake under the influence of the preceding phrase ἑννέα καὶ εἴκοσι τάλαντα. The error was made at least as early as B. Exod rendered the עשרים of its parent text correctly by καὶ τριάκοντα.

Further change in numbers was also effected in the tradition in vv.3 and 7.

393 τρισχίλιους] -λίοι B 68'-120' = Ra

— πεντακοσίους] -σιοι B 68'-120' = Ra

397 ἑβδομήκοντα B F^a F^h O-15-707^{txt} 19' 129 n 71' 392 68'-120' 55 426 Latcod 103 Arab Arm Syh] pr τριακοσια f-129 30'-85'^{ms}-130^{ms} 799 = Compl; DCC Latcod 100; LXXII Latcod 103; pr τετρακοσια (-σιοι 321^{txt}) rell

— δισχίλιοι] χίλιοι B 129 68'-120' 55 = Ra

— τετρακόσιοι] πεντακοσιοι B 15-707 f 71' 392 68'-120' 55 799 = Ra

In v.3 the nominative forms could not possibly be the original text. These words are part of the compound number τὰς ἐξήκοντα μυριάδας καὶ τρισχίλιους καὶ πεντακοσίους καὶ πεντήκοντα. The phrase is governed by the preposition εἰς and all the declinables are therefore in the accusative. The nominative variant was probably due to v.2 where the nominative is quite correct.

For v.7 in each case Exod = $\mathfrak{M}$, which has „seventy talents, and 2000 and 400 shekels.” Ra follows the text of B but this is a highly dubious text. It quite rightly does not have the popular τετρακοσια added before “seventy talents.” The addition must have come in from the “400” shekels. Thus the last variant reading above, i.e. “500” for “400” must be wrong. The text must have read τετρακόσιοι for it to be the source of the “400” as applied to talents. If B then is wrong in having πεντακοσιοι (i.e. that τετρακόσιοι which equals $\mathfrak{M}$ is correct), it is also likely to be secondary in reading χίλιοι for δισχίλιοι. The original Exod did follow $\mathfrak{M}$ throughout exactly with respect to the amount of copper available to the builders.

J. Adjective Phrases.

212 (τῷ δὲ) ἔτει τῷ ἑβδόμῳ] εβδομω ετει B O'-29 58 25 f-129 n-458 318-527 120'-128'-628 426 799 = Ra

Since $\mathfrak{M}$ simply has ובשבעה, it does not help in determining the original text. Furthermore both the phrase as adopted for Exod and the variant text adopted by Ra are fully acceptable in Greek. Only Exod usage elsewhere can determine which order is likely to be original.

The question concerns designations for time, i.e. day, month or year accompanied

by a simple ordinal numeral. Complex ordinals occur only twice (12₁₈ 16₁) in both of which the ordinal automatically precedes the noun, i. e. “on the 14th (or 15th) day.”

The normal pattern throughout Exod is articulated noun-articulated ordinal. This occurs thirty two times in Exod. Only one could be considered problematic. At 22₃₀ Ra adopted *τη δε ογδοη ημερα* for which the evidence is very sparse, viz. B 82 126 118'-537 129 120'-128'-628 426; mss 767 x 799 omit *ἡμέρα* *τῇ*, and all others witness to *τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ὀγδόῃ*. Particularly in view of the usage pattern elsewhere the majority reading is to be preferred.

Other exceptions to the general usage pattern obtain in the set phrase rendering the idiom *שְׁשִׁים וְשֵׁשׁ* (גם) *תְּמוּל*. This is rendered by *ἐχθὲς καὶ τρίτην ἡμέραν* (57₁₄) or by *ἐχθὲς καὶ* (or *οὐδὲ*) *πρὸ τῆς τρίτης ἡμέρας* 4₁₀ 21₃₆, i. e. the ordinal precedes the word for day. Beyond this there is only one instance in which the ordinal precedes the noun in Exod.

40₁₅ *τῷ δευτέρῳ* | *ἔτει*] tr O Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

Why Exod should abandon the normal pattern for the book here is puzzling. It should be noted that this occurs in the last part of the book. Could it be an indication of a different translator for these final chapters?

23₁₁ *τὰ θηρία τὰ ἄγρια* 960] *τα αγρια θηρια* B 82'-767 19' 129 n x 392 = Ra

23₃₁ *τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου*] *του μεγαλου ποταμου* B 72-82-381' 125 56^c-129-246 318 128'-407-628 55 426 509 = Ra

Both kinds of nominal phrases are fully acceptable in Greek, but the pattern adopted as original is the favored one in Exod; cf the preceding note on the order with ordinals. Furthermore in both instances the support for the variant is rather slight; the original text is not only the majority tradition, it is also supported by all the older (uncial) witnesses except B. Presumably the favored pattern was attractive to the translator since it is also the regular pattern in Hebrew, though in 23₃₁ $\mathfrak{M}$ actually lacks the adjective entirely.

The favored pattern occurs 75 times in Exod, excluding the ordinal as modifier which was discussed in the preceding note. The only exceptions are limited to the idiom “the red sea” (10₁₉ 13₁₈ 23₃₁) which follow the pattern article-modifier-nominal, and the following.

30₄ *τὴν στρεπτήν στεφάνην*

36₁ *τὰ ἅγια καθήκοντα*

36₂ *τοὺς ἐκουσίως βουλομένους*

37₇ *τὰ πρὸς λίβα ἰστία*

39₂ *τῶν ἐπεσεμμένων ἀνδρῶν*

39₁₂ *τὸ δὲ λοιπὸν χρυσίον*

39₁₃ *τὴν καταλειφθεῖσαν ὑάκινθον*

It will be clear that the exceptions in the above list occur almost exclusively in the last chapters where the pattern of translation has apparently changed. Within the complex chh. 35—40 the dominant pattern occurred 20 times. It would seem that the translation patterns for the adjective phrase differ here from that of the first 34 chh.

32₁₁ (*ἐν*) *βραχίονι (ὕψηλῳ)*] *τω βρ. σου* B 15' 56'-129 71' 392 68'-120' 55 799 = Ra; + *σου* 376-707-767 C''-16⁷⁷ d 53' n⁻⁴⁵⁸ s t 527 318 126-128'-628 319 426 646 L^acod 100 Arab Sa

𐤎 has a different idiom בִּיד חֻקָּה, and the parent text of Exod was probably similar to בִּיד חֻקָּה of Sam. The phrase is coordinate to בָּכָה גָּדוֹל which Exod rendered literally by ἐν ἰσχύι μεγάλῃ. The three phrases are common in the Pentateuch, particularly in Deuteronomy, for characterizing Yahweh's deliverance of Israel. These phrases are found in Exod as follows:

616 3211 ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ
 61 133 9 16 ἐν γὰρ χειρὶ κραταιᾷ
 1314 ἐν χειρὶ κραταιᾷ
 1716 ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαίᾳ
 148 ἐν χειρὶ ὑψηλῇ
 3211 ἐν ἰσχύι μεγάλῃ; cf also 156 ἐν ἰσχύι

It will be seen that in those set phrases there is no articulation nor is there a genitive pronoun modifying the noun. It would be unlikely that the translator would suddenly change the pattern and that only in the second part of a coordinate phrase. The original text here is also ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ, whereas the variant tradition chosen by Ra comes from Deut 9²⁹.

K. Proper nouns.

312 Μωυσῆ M(mg*) 15'-58-376 53^cpr^m-56'-664 527* 128' 799] μωυσσει 68'; μωσει 72 57-77-78-414'-550'-615^c-739-761; μωση 64(mg)-618 14'-25-52-54-73-131-313-413-422-500-615*; μωση μωση 126; μωσης 53*; πρὸς μωυσην (aut μωσην aut μωση) 426 b d⁻¹⁰⁶ n-628 s t 392-527^c 18 55 Syh^{mg}; αὐτῷ 707 628; μωυσει rell = Ra
 427 Μωυσῆ] μωυσει A 56-129 407 = Ra; μωσει B 52-54-77-615^c-739-761 424; μωυσσει 68
 1622 Μωυσῆ] μωυσει 761* 129 68'-120 = Ra; μωσει B 72-426
 186 Μωυσῆ] μωυσει B 343 68'-120' = Ra; μωσει 72
 1813 Μωυσῆ] μωυσει B 56-129 343 68'-120' = Ra; μωσει 15^c-72-426
 3118 Μωυσῆ] μωυσει Fb 54 56-129 343 68-120'-122^c = Ra; μωσει B 72

Why Ra should have accepted the itacistic μωυσει spelling for the dative of Μωυσῆς is hard to understand, since he accepted Μωυσῆ as his text 30 times in Exodus (as well as usually elsewhere). A translator would hardly mix up his spellings in such an arbitrary fashion; only scribes would introduce variation. The "correct" spelling of the name is Μωυσῆς — nominative, Μωυσῆ — genitive, Μωυσῆ — dative, and Μωυσῆν — accusative not only throughout Exod, but throughout the entire Pentateuch.

615 'Ωαδ We.] ιωαδ B 56'-129 120' 799; ιωαδι A; ιωαδ 58 68'; δωδ 426; ιαωδ 121^c-392 59 130 Bo Syh^{Tmg}; λωδ 318; αωδαν 82; αδδ[.] Ach; ιαωχ Fb; αμωδ 127-343'; λōt Sa; λωδ 18; αωδ rell = Ra

The reading of B+ supports ωαδ with the dittograph of *iota* from the preceding καί. 𐤎 has 𐤣𐤇𐤁 (vocalized 'ōhad. The readings ιωαδ and ιαωαδι show further developments of the B reading. The popular αωδ simply transposed the first two letters and promoted such readings as αωδαν, λωδ, λωδ and even ιαωχ and αμωδ. The name also occurs at Gen 46¹⁰ where Gen mistakenly has 'Αωδ; this needs revision to 'Ωαδ.

618 'Αμράμ] αμβραμ A B οI⁻⁶¹⁸-15-707 25-54-57-73-550 125^c 129(mg)-246 85-127-343'-730 x 509 646 L^{at}cod 100 Ach Sa = Ra; αμβραν 75 18

- 620 Ἀμράμ 1°] ἀμβραμ A oI^{-618c}-15-707 25-57'-422-550 125 129-246 85-127-321^c-343 121 18
424 509 646 Latcod 100 Ach Bo^B = Ra; ἀμβραν B 73 75 30^c-344-730 76'
620 Ἀμράμ 2°] ἀμβραμ A oI-15-707 25-57'-73-313-422-550 129-246 75^c 30'-85-127-344 71
121' 18 319 509 646 Latcod 100 Bo^B = Ra; ἀμβραν B 75*-458 76

There is no good reason for the insertion of a *beta* between the *mu* and the *rho*, since the Hebrew is עמרם. The tendency to insert a stop between a nasal and a *rho* is normal in Greek phonotactics, but proper names are, after all, transliterations first and in the course of scribal activity such adaptations are easily adopted to Hellenic practice. Cf also Num 319.

- 618 Ἰσαάρ] ισσααρ A^c M oI⁻⁶¹⁸-15-29 C'-761-57'-73 53-56-664^c n⁻⁶²⁸ s⁻³⁴³ x y z 18 130 509
799 Sa = Ra; ισααρ 59; ισσααρ F; saar Arm; ισσαχαρ B 55
621 Ἰσαάρ 58-82 550*-552 19 d 53'-246 628 t 392 76' 509 Latcod 100 Bo^{A^c}] σααρ F 376-707
25-126 321*(cprm) 59 646 Ach Arm Bo^B; zaar Bo^{A*}; ισσαρα 18; ισσααρ 130; εσσααρ 72;
ασσααρ n⁻⁶²⁸; ισσαχαρ 55; ισσααρ rell = Ra

For the correctness of Ἰσαάρ as choice for original text cf THGN 115f.

- 621 Νάφεγ F 426-oI C''-78* 552 s⁻⁷³⁰ 121 55 646] αφεγ 730; να[...] 78*; ναφες 552 118'-537;
ναφεις 319; ναφης 76; ναφερ 799; ναφετ 135 59; ναβεκ 628; nabeg Arm^{ap}; nageb Arm^{te};
ναφες και μησα 707; aphek Sa; ναφεκ rell = Ra

The Hebrew text has נפג. The name also occurs as the name of a son of David in 2 Sam 515 I Chron 37 146, but is otherwise unknown. The devoicing of the final palatal stop to produce ναφεκ is, however, not original, but is due to assimilation to the καί which follows immediately.

- 623 Ἐλισάβε A* 426 Syh] ελισταβεθ 82 19' 56'-129 407 Arm Sa = Ra; ελισταβεθ B; ...]σαβεθ
835; ελισταδ 628; > 72; ελισταβετ (ελισσ. 18; ελιβ. 75) rell

The name occurs only here. מלשיבע has and is correctly transliterated by Exod. The reading ελισταβεθ adopted by Ra (because of B's ελισταβεθ) is secondary, the result of dittography, the following word being θυγατέρα. This error led in turn to the majority reading of ελισταβετ, but only the reading of A* 426 can be original text.

- 1523 (εἰς) Μέρραν] μερρα B 58-82-426 56^c 127 130 Bo = Ra; myrra Sa; mwr' Syh; mera Arm
— (ἐκ) Μέρρας] merra Bo; myrra Sa; mwr' Syh

Ra has μερρα for the first and μερρας for the second. Either it is to be taken as a borrowed word, i.e. a transcription and thus uninflected, or it is to be a Hellenized name and thus inflected, but this must be the case for both. That is to say, either both must be taken as μερρα, or they are to be inflected as in the critical text. Since all ms evidence supports Μέρρας for the genitive, Ra must be wrong in choosing the uninflected form for the accusative.

- 1714 Ἰησοῦ] ιησοι B = Ra

Ra states in the Apparatus for this verse "ambo mss. inter -σοι et -σου fluctuant, ego ubique B sequor." This seems to me unfortunate, since the translator would hardly have been inconsistent himself. The correct forms are Ἰησοῦς — nominative, Ἰησοῦ — genitive and dative, and Ἰησοῦν — accusative. For a probable explanation

of *ηησαι* cf THGD 62. Cf also v. 9 where B^c has *ηησαι* not *ηησου* but Ra does not recognize the corrector.

312 *Οὐρί*] *ουριου* (-ρειου B* Sixt; *ωρ.* 15; *ορ.* 646) B 15' C" 527 46 55 646 = Ra
 3530 *Οὐρί*] *ουριου* (*ουρειου* B*; *ορ.* 82 54-57-73 59) B *οII*-29 C"-131mg 527 318 126 59 424 = Ra
 3720 *Οὐρί*] *ουρ(ε)ιου* B 376-*οII*-29 52'-414'-552-761 129 527 55 = Ra; *οριου* 72

𐤒 has אורי, and there is no good reason for adopting the reading chosen by Ra. The origin of the reading is basically a partial dittograph. The next word was *υἱοῦ* (not *τον* as Ra), and /uri hiu/ easily led to /uriu hiu/, i.e. *ουρι υιου* became *ουριου υιου*.

It should be emphasized that the *ουριου* variant also demonstrates that only the popular reading *υἱοῦ* is to be taken as Exod. Note the variants.

312 *υἱοῦ*] *υιον* F^b 72-707¹ 619* 646'; *τον υιον* 527; *τον* B 15' 55 426 = Ra; *τον του* 767 n
 3530 *υἱοῦ*] *τον* B 15' 55 426 = Ra; *υιον* F 376 53'-56 527 392 126 799 Arm Syh(vid); *τον του* n; *του* 707; > C"-131mg 59 424

If the above reconstruction is correct, the Ra text at 3720 was due to the development in the other two instances. Nor does the Ra reading make much sense. Beseleel's father was Ouri, who was in turn the son of Hor. The *τον* variant makes the antecedent Beseleel, which is absurd.

3534 *Ἀρχισμάχ*] -μακ B 58'-82 121 416^c(vid) ^{Lat}cod 103(vid) = Ra; *αρχισαμακ* 59
 3721 *Ἀρχισμάχ*] -μακ B 58'-82 55* = Ra; *αρχισαμακ* 59

At 316 אַחִיסַמַך was transcribed by *Ἀρχισμάχ*, and there is no good reason to follow the inconsistent B text here. The spelling with final *kappa* is sparsely supported, just as at 316 where only 58'-707¹-708 129 55 and 59 have a final *kappa*, and it is most unlikely to be original text here.

L. Prepositions.

1. The later tradition often added prepositions to the original text.

519 *τῆς* A B 15-426 392 z-128'] pr *απο* rell = 𐤒

The context is *ἀπολείψετε τῆς πλινθείας* for 𐤒 תגרעו מלבניכם. The Greek verb only occurs twice in Exod, the other instance being found in 1210 where the verb is modified by *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* (only ms 500 omits *ἀπ'*). Both constructions are possible; the simple genitive obtains in the sense of "to be wanting in number" which is exactly what is intended here. If the shorter text is original, the popular *απο* variant would constitute a hebraizing correction. The *ἀπ' αὐτοῦ* of 1210 is justified as a literal rendering of its parent text ממנו, although simple *αὐτοῦ* would be more idiomatic Greek.

611 *Φαραὸ βασιλεῖ* A B 15'-58'-707 f 628 71' ^{Lat}cod 100] pr *προς* 108; *προς φαραω βασιλεα* (> 106) rell

ⲙ has אל פרעה מלך. The problem concerns the way in which the addressee is designated after verbs of speaking. In such contexts ⲙ almost invariably uses אל. Exod, however, has either *πρός* plus the accusative or simply the dative. Here it concerns *λάλησον*. The root *λαλέω* is followed by the addressee in the dative 21 times. The addressee is designated by *πρός* with the accusative 28 times of which one half occurs in the formula “and said N to N.” Since the translator used either pattern indiscriminately, one can only follow the witness of the oldest witnesses, and here adopt the dative with Ra. Cf also v.27.

89 τοῦ λαοῦ 1° 970] pr περι B 64^mg-376 d⁻¹²⁵ f⁻¹²⁹ s⁽⁻³⁴³⁾ 84-370 392 55 130 799 Aeth = Ra
ⲙ

In Hebrew prepositions are regularly repeated before coordinated nouns, but in Greek this need not be done (and in good Greek style is not done). The translator wavers between these two patterns. Here there are three coordinate nominals: *σοῦ, τῶν θεραπεύοντων σου* and *τοῦ λαοῦ σου*. Shortly thereafter in the verse three coordinate prepositional phrases (resp. with *ἀπό, ἀπό* and *ἐκ*) occur. For *περί* 229 gives an interesting example, where in ⲙ פשע is modified by five asyndetic על phrases. There Exod used *περί* only for the first and the other four are strung along joined by *καί* throughout but without a repeated preposition. Accordingly the witness of the oldest Greek ms witness, in the above case the second century 970, is followed in choosing a critical text.

2930 τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ B 82 414* 129 426] > 18; pr και 55; pr ο εκ M^mg; pr εκ rell

With the possible exception of *ἐκ τῶν Ἑβραίων* of 27 Exod did not use *εκ* to render the partitive מן. The normal pattern is *ἀπό* with the genitive as e.g. *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἵματος* 29_{12 21} 30₁₀ and *ἀπὸ τῶν κρεῶν* of 29₃₄, or the simple genitive as 24₁ *τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, 24₉ *τῆς γερονσίας*, 29₂₀ *τοῦ αἵματος*, and 29₃₄ *τῶν ἄρτων*. So in spite of sparse support the simple genitive (modifying *ὁ ἱερεὺς ὁ ἀντ’ αὐτοῦ*) is to be preferred to the popular *εκ*, which is apparently a later correction in the tradition based on the Hebrew text.

2941 ὁσμήν A B F^a oII⁻²⁹ f n s 527 55 426 799 Bo] pr εις rell = Ra ⲙ

Admittedly, ⲙ has the standard phrase לריח ניחח which is commonly rendered in the Pentateuch by *εἰς ὁσμήν εὐωδίας*, and so the popular reading has it either ex par or by hex correction — note that O Arm Syh all have it — but that is not relevant here. Since it is immediately preceded by *ποιήσεις* without an object (it is modified by *κατὰ τὴν σπονδὴν αὐτοῦ*), the translator neatly simplified the Greek by making *ὁσμήν εὐωδίας* the direct object of the verb, thereby making this *ποιήσεις* clause coordinate with the first *ποιήσεις* clause. It should also be noted that vv. 18 25 have *εἰς ὁσμήν εὐωδίας*, i.e. Exod is thus the source of the rendering frequently found in Lev and Num.

3035 αὐτό] αὐτω 16-54 f⁻¹²⁹ 458^c 134 x⁻⁶¹⁹ 426 799; εν αυτω B 15 129 55 = Ra

ⲙ has אתה and agrees with the following word קמרת. Exod follows this exactly with its *αὐτὸ θυμίαμα*. In both cases there is no given antecedent, but the general

sense is clear; it is the incense with which vv. 34—38 is dealing. The translator does make one interesting change; instead of the second singular verb *עשית*, he uses the third plural *ποιήσουσιν*; contextually this makes excellent sense. Reference was made in the preceding verse to the various ingredients for the holy incense. The recipe called for equal parts. Now these various spices combined make it (i.e. the unnamed but understood incense) as a *θυμίαμα μυρεψικὸν ἔργον μυρεψοῦ, μεμιγμένον* κ. τ. λ.

Presumably the origin of the peculiar B+ reading is rooted in the dative spelling of *αὐτό*. The tradition made very little sense out of *αὐτω* and the *εν αὐτω* probably represents an unsuccessful attempt at improving that text. It is certainly not worthy of consideration for the critical text.

3220 *πυρί*] pr *εν* B 707-767 Cⁿ-14(1^o) d n⁻⁴⁵⁸ s t 424 646 Syh = Ra **ℳ**
3413 *πυρί*] pr *εν* B 64* 500 n⁻¹²⁷ 318 126-128'-628 Syh = Ra

When a verb semantically related to fire occurs in Exod followed by *πυρί* the dative noun is not governed by *εν* (cf 32 128⁹ 29¹⁴ 34). Only when the dative precedes, is it governed by *έν* (1210 *έν πυρί κατακάυσετε*). Since this usually represents *בא* in **ℳ**, i.e. a prepositional phrase, and either *πυρί* or *έν πυρί* are possible translations, only the translation pattern of the translator can give one a clue as to the original text. In the two cases introducing this note the *εν* seems likely to be secondary. It might also be added that the use of the *εν* is more Hebraic than Greek as far as style is concerned.

3431 *αὐτοῖς Μωσῆς* B 129] *προς αυτους μωσῆς* 15'-376 120'-126 55 426; *προς αυτους* 107'-125; *μωσῆς* (c var) *προς αυτους* rell = **ℳ**

The verb *λαλέω* is usually accompanied by an indication of the addressee, and this may be indicated by *προς* plus the accusative or by the simple dative. It seems to make no difference whatsoever as to which is chosen in Exod. Nor does their contiguity to the verb make any difference. Thus only the evidence of the oldest witness can help to decide; in the above this means accepting *αὐτοῖς* even though only two mss have it. Note that the word order is also changed in the majority text; this is quite clearly a hebraizing correction, probably the work of Origen.

353 *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* B 15' f⁻¹²⁹ 392 68'-120' 55 426 799 Lat^{cod} 100] pr *εν* rell = **ℳ**

The word *ביום* is usually rendered by *τῇ ἡμέρᾳ* without the preposition *εν* if an ordinal follows it attributively. Only at 1627 where the phrase *έν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ* occurs (only mss 25 118'-537 44 f⁻¹²⁹ 75 x 527 76' 509 omit the *έν*) is this pattern not followed; cf, however, *έν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ* at 402. There is no good reason not to accept the phrase without *εν* in 353 as well. The variant is a hebraizing revision, possibly hex.

374 *χρυσίῳ*] pr *εν* B 68'-120' = Ra

That the preposition is secondary is proven by the usage pattern of Exod. The dative of "gold, silver," or "bronze" occurs 32 times modifying a verb or participle with the general sense of "overlay, cover, gild." These all occur in the two tabernacle ac-

counts, chh.25—31 and 35—40. In no case is the preposition used, and there is no good reason to think that the translator made an exception here.

2. Omission of a preposition in the tradition.

831 om *ἀπό* 2° B 82 56'-129 68'-120' 130 799 Sa = Ra

— om *ἀπό* 3° B 82 126 *b* 106 56'-129 *x* 392 120'-128' 130 799 Sa = Ra

The translator is not consistent in his rendering of coordinate π prepositional phrases in the matter of repeating the preposition, though he tends to repetition. Thus in 69 he has *ἀπὸ τῆς ὀλιγοψυχίας καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ἔργων*, in 88 *ἀπ' ἐμοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐμοῦ λαοῦ*, 89 *ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ σου καὶ ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ὑμῶν*, 811 *ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ὑμῶν καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἐπαύλεων καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θεραπόντων σου καὶ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ σου*, but at 829 *ἀπὸ σοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θεραπόντων σου καὶ τοῦ λαοῦ σου*, i.e. without an *ἀπό* before the last noun. For similar omissions of a repeated *ἀπό* cf 125 and 2934. In view of the weak support for a shorter text in v.31 it seems safer to adopt the repeated preposition for the critical text.

93 *ἐν (ταῖς καμήλοις)*] > B 82 44 *f* 527 *z* Sa = Ra

The predicate ויהי is modified by a series of six coordinate π prepositional phrases in $\mathfrak{M}$. The last two omit the expected *ἐν*, i.e. *βουσὶν καὶ προβάτοις*. The first three, *τοῖς κτήνεσίν σου*, *τοῖς ἵπποις* and *τοῖς ὑποζυγίοις* all have *ἐν* before them. The fourth in the series is *ταῖς καμήλοις* and most mss witness to an *ἐν* before the phrase, but 15 mss including B do not and Ra accepts the shorter text. It should be noted, however, that nos. 1 2 and 3 are all articulated and are governed by *ἐν*; nos. 5 and 6 are not articulated, nor are they governed by *ἐν*. Since no. 4 is articulated, the *ἐν* is probably to be read as well.

263 *ἐκ τῆς ἐτέρας* 2°] *τη ετερα* B 82 129 *x* *z*⁽⁻¹²⁶⁾ 55 426 ^{Lat}cod 102 = Ra

The phrase is part of the collocation *συνεχόμεναι ἐτέρα ἐκ τῆς ἐτέρας* 2°, a rendering of חברת אשה אל אחת in $\mathfrak{M}$. The more usual phrase in $\mathfrak{M}$ would be חברת אחת אל אחת which in fact is what Sam has. So too the variant represented by B+ is the more usual phrase in Exod (or with the accusative instead of the dative). It is an unusual translation, but it occurs for exactly the same phrase earlier in the verse with full support in the tradition. The variant is a simplification of the text possibly under the influence of v.6 where $\mathfrak{M}$ has the same phrase. The *lectio difficilior* is to be preferred here.

3221 *πρός*] *τω* B 15' 129 71' 55 = Ra

After *εἶπεν* (or *εἶπαν* or *εἶπον*-imperative) the addressee is usually introduced in Exod by a *πρός* phrase unless that addressee is designated by a pronoun. Occasionally, however, nouns appear in the dative and such nouns are then usually articulated. If the addressee is *Μωυση* it is not articulated since this proper noun is inflected for case. This is unfortunately not the case with Aaron which is not inflected

(7¹⁹ 85¹⁶), but only at 8¹⁶ is Ἀαρών not modified by τῷ ἀδελφῷ σου. Others are articulated, viz. τῷ Φαραῷ 1¹⁹ 8¹⁹ and τῷ Ἰησοῦ 17⁹.

Though the addressee is usually designated by a πρὸς phrase (as e.g. πρὸς Μωυσῆν 51 times), the dative does occur in the following as well: 1⁹ τῷ ἔθνει, 6⁶ 25² 33⁵ 35³⁰ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ, 1¹⁵ ταῖς μαίαις, 2²⁰ ταῖς θυγατέραςιν, 19¹⁵ τῷ λαῷ, and 16⁹ πάσῃ συναγωγῇ. Ὡ usually designates the addressee by the preposition ἐκ, but also uses ἐν. This distinction is disregarded by Exod entirely, i.e. there is no correspondence between the two pairs: ἐκ may be rendered by the dative or by a πρὸς phrase, and ἐν which occurs only infrequently is rendered by the dative three times and by πρὸς once. In view of the preponderance of πρὸς, whenever there is uncertainty in the tradition it is safer to choose πρὸς.

32²⁹ om ἐν 2° B 15-707-767 73'-550' b 53'-56 n⁻⁷⁵ 392 799 Latcod 103 = Ra

The context reads ἐν τῷ νύμφῃ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἀδελφῷ which represents בְּבִנּוֹ וּבִאִתּוֹ of Ὡ. Though Hebrew normally repeats the preposition in a coordinate phrase, it is quite unnecessary in Greek. Thus it becomes a matter of investigating how the translator tended to translate the coordinate phrases with the preposition ἐν. The following constitute the instances in Exod where a preposition obtains in a coordinate phrase, i.e. in a coordinate phrase with two members. Variants given will concern only the addition or omission of ἐν before the second member.

- 6⁶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ καὶ κρίσει μεγάλη. Add ἐν 29 527 509 Latcod 100 Syh
- 7¹⁹ ἐν τε τοῖς ξύλοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς λίθοις. Omit ἐν 707 Cⁿ⁻¹²⁶ 318 130 646'
- 8³ ἐν τοῖς φινράμασιν σου καὶ ἐν τοῖς κλιβάνοις σου
- 8¹⁷ ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν. Omit ἐν 125
- 8¹⁸ ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν. Omit ἐν 57-78
- 9¹⁰ ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν. Omit ἐν d
- 9¹¹ ἐν τοῖς φαρμάκοις καὶ ἐν πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου
- 10¹⁵ ἐν τοῖς ξύλοις καὶ ἐν πάσῃ βοτάνῃ
- 12¹⁹ ἐν τε τοῖς γιώραις καὶ (+ τοῖς O-15 b) αὐτόχθοσιν. Add ἐν b
- 14⁴ ἐν Φαραῷ καὶ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ στρατιᾷ αὐτοῦ
- 31¹⁷ ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἰσραὴλ. Add ἐν 72-376-707¹ Arm(vid) Syh
- 32¹¹ ἐν ἰσχύι μεγάλη καὶ ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ
- 34¹⁰ ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ καὶ ἐν παντὶ ἔθνει. Om ἐν 618 118'-537

Out of the list of 13 all but three repeat the preposition, which seems to be the translator's favorite way of dealing with it. Accordingly the ἐν has also been adopted for 32²⁹.

When more than two members obtain the translator tends to omit the preposition towards the end, though by no means necessarily. Cf the following where the preposition ἐν is involved more than twice.

- 14⁴ ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις . . . (+ ἐν 129) τῷ πληθὺ καὶ τῇ πλινθείᾳ καὶ πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔργοις
 - 8¹⁶ ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν (> 44') τοῖς τετράποσιν καὶ ἐν (> 618* 422) πάσῃ γῇ Αἰγύπτου.
- The same text appears in 9⁹ without Hebrew support.
- 9³ ἐν τε τοῖς ἵπποις καὶ ἐν (> 82-618 16-54-77-414' f x 527 z 509) τοῖς ὑποζυγίοις καὶ ἐν (> B 82 44 f 527 z Sa) ταῖς καμήλοις καὶ (+ ἐν 15 628; + ἐν τοῖς 381' 422 x 799 Arm Pal Syh) βοῦσιν καὶ προβάτοις
 - 14¹⁸ ἐν Φαραῷ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἄρμασιν καὶ (+ (✱ Syh) ἐν τοῖς F^b M^{ms} O¹⁻²⁹ 72¹³⁵-381' Cⁿ 19' 107' 53' n s t x 527 z 46 76' 509 Arab Arm Pal Syh) ἵπποις αὐτοῦ

The most unusual of the above is 114 where only the first noun is governed by *ἐν* and the next three are without a repeated preposition.

Occasionally *τε* is added after the first *ἐν* of two prepositional phrases. Cf the following list.

816 *ἐν τε*] om *τε* 15 C''-126 424 646

817 *ἐν τε*] om *τε* B 707 550' 71 120'

818 *ἐν τε*] om *τε* A B O'-29 135 426 127 x 68'-120' = Ra

99 *ἐν τε*] om *τε* 25* 56*

910 *ἐν τε*] om *τε* B O-376-15'-707 C''-16 (414' 550'txt) b 53'-129 628 x 120' 59 646 = Ra

In each of these the *τε* is part of the compound phrase *ἐν τε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς τετράποσιν*, which apparently was a set phrase in the mind of the translator. In fact, when a compound "in" phrase is introduced by *ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις*, it always contains the *τε* particle.

It is used in exactly the same fashion in 719 *ἐν τε τοῖς ξύλοις καὶ ἐν τοῖς λίθοις*, 93 *ἐν τε τοῖς ἵπποις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ὑπόζυγίοις*, and 1219 *ἐν τε τοῖς γιώραις καὶ αὐτόχθοσιν*.

3. Change of preposition in the tradition.

612 *ἐναντίον*] *ἐναντι* B 56'-129 = Ra

The use of *ἐναντι* is unusually restricted to the latter part of the book, not occurring before 2721. Once it governs *τοῦ θεοῦ* and the other 20 occurrences are all before *κυρίου*. It never appears before any other noun nor before pronouns.

In the above instance the word governed is *κυρίου*. The only other cases of *ἐναντίον κυρίου* are as follows.

630 *ἐναντίον*] *ἐναντι* F O'-376 708-15 C''-126 552txt 56 127-458 t-370 x 122 59 76' 509 646; *προς* 55

1016 *ἐναντίον*] *ἐναντι* 77; *ἐνώπιον* 509

3424 *ἐναντίον*] *ἐναντι* F 15'-29-72-767 C''-131 414' 761 53'-56 127 85txt-130txt-321'txt-343-344txt 392 68' 46 55 59 799; *ἐνώπιον* 376 30'-85mg-130mg-321'mg-344mg 426 509; > 761

The word *ἐνώπιον* obtains only 13 times, of which three occur before *τοῦ θεοῦ* (36 2289), and the following two before *κυρίου*.

2317 *ἐνώπιον*] *ἐναντιον* 314-537

3423 *ἐνώπιον*] *ἐναντιον* O-376 C''-550 n 85'txt-130txt-321'txt-343-344txt

It would not be unreasonable in view of the above information to adopt *ἐναντίον* at 612, particularly in view of the sparse support for *ἐναντι*.

The following instances merit some discussion as well.

2721 *ἐναντι*] *ἐναντιον* B 58'-82-376c C''-16 77 500* b d 129 t y-121 z-628 = Ra

2826 *ἐναντι* 1°] *ἐναντιον* B O-72-82 129 n-127 128 = Ra

2826 *ἐναντι* 2°] *ἐναντιον* B O-29 53'-129 75 527(2°) 59 426 = Ra

2831 *ἐναντι*] *ἐναντιον* B 53' 75 = Ra

3428 *ἐναντι*] *ἐναντιον* B 707 C'' 75 s-130 527 = Ra

In each of these five cases it is the phrase *ἐναντι κυρίου* which is involved, which as said earlier occurs 20 times in Exod, whereas *ἐναντίον κυρίου* occurs only four times. Obviously the former is the favored phrase, particularly beginning with ch.27. Whenever as in these five cases the support for *ἐναντιον* is not decisive, preference should be given to *ἐναντι*.

In Exod *ἐναντίον* (occurring 44 times) is in most contexts the favored preposition, particularly for articulated nouns (17 times) and always before *Φαραώ* (13 times). The only articulated noun occurring otherwise is *θεοῦ*; this occurs with *ἐναντι* at 28²³ and with *ἐνώπιον* at 3⁶ 22⁸⁹. Before pronouns *ἐναντίον* occurs six times, and *ἐνώπιον*, seven times.

811 *ἐκ* 1°] απο F M O''-58 82' C'' b d(-125) s t γ-527 68' 18 55 59 76'

The context reads: And the frogs will be removed from you and from your houses and from your encampments and from your servants and from your people. The prepositions representing "from" are *ἀπό* and *ἐκ*. The translator with fine feeling used *ἐκ* for the second and third ones, i.e. *out of* your houses and *out of* your encampments, but *ἀπό* with the other three, i.e. *away from* you, your servants, and your people. The variant above concerns "out of your houses." The popular variant *ἀπό* was undoubtedly due to the influence of the first phrase, *ἀπό σου*. One might well compare v. 13 where *ἐκ* (though modifying *ἐτελεύτησαν*) is used with exactly the same nuance as in v. 11, there successively with *οἰκιῶν*, *ἐπαύλεων* and *ἀγρῶν*.

1424 *ἐπί* B 82 f-129 646 Co] > 44; *εις* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The context is *καὶ ἐπέβλεψεν κύριος ἐπὶ τὴν παρεμβολήν*. $\mathfrak{M}$ has *לך* but Sam has *לך*, and it could be argued that Exod's parent text had *לך*. In that case the *εις* of the majority text constitutes an early hebraizing correction. It is difficult to argue on the basis of the verb employed since it is used only here in Exodus. Exod does use all kinds of verbal compounds with *ἐπι* and they are commonly modified by *ἐπί* phrases. In only three instances did an *εις* phrase modify an *ἐπι* compound verb.

420 *ἐπέστρεψεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον*
1013 *ἐπῆρεν . . . εἰς οὐρανόν*
1610 *ἐπεστράφησαν εἰς τὴν ἔρημον*

In all three cases direction towards is indicated, and *ἐπί* would have been lexically wrong. Two other instances of the verb *ἐπιστρέφειν* modified by a *πρός* phrase are similarly semantically bound to avoid *ἐπί*. Thus Exod usage does seem to suggest that *ἐπί* is also preferable at 1424, and it has therefore been chosen as critical text.

1524 *ἐπί* B f-53 392 z 130 799] *προς* 82; *κατα* rell

The preposition modifies *διεγόγγυζεν* which can take either *ἐπί* or *κατά* to designate the personal object of the murmuring. At 162 *ἐπί* is used and at 167⁸ *κατά* occurs. There is no good reason to object to Ra's choice of *ἐπί* at 1524.

There is, however, good reason to disagree with Ra at 173.

ἐπί] *προς* B F 106-125 x 59 ^{Lat}codd 102 104 = Ra

The verb here is the simplex *ἐγόγγυζεν*, but that really makes no difference to the prepositional modification. The preposition *προς* is unlikely to be correct. The fact that Luc 5³⁰ has *πρός* is irrelevant. It reads *καὶ ἐγόγγυζεν . . . πρὸς τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ λέγοντες*. The revolt is against an action of Jesus and it is being mediated through the disciples; the murmuring is not against the disciples. The original must have been *ἐπί* at 173 and not *προς*.

1616 σύν] τοις εν F O^{-58mg} 82 19' 44' s t⁻⁸⁴ 318' 55* Arab Co Syh^{LxtT}; εν A Fa oI C⁷⁸ 118'-537 125-610 53' 127^{mg} 84 121-527 68' 55c 59 76' 646 Lat^{cod} 102; > 127^{txt} 509

The Exod text reads *ἐκαστος σύν τοις συσκηνοῖς* which was its rendering for *אִישׁ לְאִשֶּׁר בְּאֹהֶלֹו*. That the *τοις* of the variant represents a hex plus to represent the *לְאִשֶּׁר* seems quite obvious, but not so obvious is the *εν* variant. It might be thought that it too was hex in origin, but this is unlikely. One should note that the text with *ἐκαστος εν τοις συσκηνοῖς* is actually the majority text; in other words *τοις εν* represents two separate variants. I suggest that the *εν* variant is only incidentally equal to *℣*. It was rather the result of auditory confusion; that is /hekastos sin/ was heard as /hekastos en/ which was then graphically realized as *εκαστος εν*. In any event the *εν* is secondary. *ἐκαστος σύν* is an intelligent rendering of the Hebrew; *εκαστος εν* is not.

185 ἐπ' ὄρους B M^{mg} 82 f 392 120'-128-628 Aeth Bo] *επι το ορος* 118'-537; *εις το ορος* rel

℣ simply has *הר*, i.e. without a preposition. The verb which the phrase modifies to indicate "place where" is *παρενέβαλεν*. The choice of preposition for the critical text can only be determined by usage. For the following statistics, all instances of the verb in the LXX have been examined for modification in some way by an indication of place where. Occasionally the interpretation may be uncertain when a clause could mean "encamped against" either in the sense of opposition to in a warlike sense or as a location, i.e. as "over against." These do not appear in the statistics.

For the Pentateuch the following usages obtain; these are mainly to be found in Num: *εις* 27 times, *εν* 15, *ἐχόμενοι* 8, *παρά* 5, *κατά* and *ἐπί* 4 each, 2 each for *ἐναντίοι κύκλω*, *πρός* or no preposition at all, and 1 each for *ἀπέναντι*, *ἔξω*, *κατέναντι* and *κύκλω*. Not counted are instances with *ἐκεῖ*, which would be irrelevant.

For Mac I the instances are: *ἐπί* 13, *εν* 7, *κατά* 4, 2 each for *εις* and *πέραν*, and one each for *ἔξ ἐναντίας* and *πλησίον*.

For the remaining historical books the usage is: *εν* 21, *ἐπί* 8, *εις* 6, and one each for *ἀπέναντι*, *ἐναντίοι κύκλω*, *κατέναντι*, *κύκλω* and *περικύκλω*.

It is thus obvious that *εν* is the most common indicator of place with the verb *παρεμβάλλειν* with 43 instances, followed closely by *εις* with 35. This latter fact is to be expected in the Hellenistic period. It should be noted that most of these obtain in the Pentateuch, and over half of these (as well as those of *εν*) are to be found in Num 33. The preposition *ἐπί* occurs 25 times, but 13 of these are to be found in Mac I, and only 4 in the Pentateuch (all in Num 3).

That *ἐπί* is taken as original here is primarily based on the notion that in view of the LXX usage patterns it would be much easier to understand the change of an *ἐπί* to an *εις* construction in the tradition than the reverse.

216 *πρός* 2°] *επι* B O⁻³⁷⁶ 25 19' 44 392c 120'-628-630 426 = Ra

At first blush the variant is most attractive. The fuller context is *πρός τὴν θύραν ἐπὶ τὸν σταθμόν* for the Hebrew *אֶל הַדֶּלֶת אוֹ אֶל הַמְּזוּזָה*. Since the second *אֶל* is rendered by *ἐπί*, one might well expect the *אֶל* in the immediately preceding phrase to be rendered by *επι* as well. This occurs in the law concerning the slave who rejects his preferred

freedom and his master brings him to the door or to the doorpost. Incidentally, for *ἐπί* some witnesses also read *πρός*: 392 120'-128'-628 426 Arab.

It should be noted that Exod does not render the correlative conjunction, possibly because of an understanding of the places intended respectively by *דלת* and *מזוזה* not as alternatives, but rather of the second phrase designating more specifically that part of the *θύρα* at which the ceremony of ear-piercing is to take place. This exegetical understanding is emphasized by the change in preposition. The master brings him *to* the door *at* the doorpost. The variant text levels out the phrases, thereby destroying the intent of Exod.

2839 *πρός* 2° B 82 129 71' 55] > 58 = *℣*; *εφ* (*επ* 127 s-³⁴³ ^{344c}) *rell*

The preposition occurs in the context *ἐπάξονται πρὸς ἑαυτούς*, Exod's rendering of *וַיִּצְאוּ*, in the clause "And they shall not bear iniquity." The verb *ἐπάγω* usually takes an *ἐπί* phrase modifier, a collocation which occurs frequently throughout the O.T. Here, however, the verb is in the middle voice, which is extremely rare in the O.T., and means "they shall bring on themselves" to which Exod adds *πρὸς ἑαυτούς* so as to emphasize the reflexive. The popular variant is due to the influence of the common *ἐπάγω ἐπί*. The *lectio difficilior* is here to be preferred.

332 *πρότερόν*] *πρ* *προ* *προσωπου σου* 767 *d* n-⁷⁵ *t*; *προ* *προσωπου* B F^a 15'-72-376 73'-550' 129 75 x 392* z 55 Syh = Ra

It is difficult to choose between *πρότερον* and *πρὸ προσώπου* since both adequately render *לפני* in the context. A good parallel to this verse occurs in 2320 *ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρὸ προσώπου σου* (cf also 346 11 24). On the other hand, just a few verses earlier there occurred (3234) *ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄγγελός μου προπορεύσεται πρὸ προσώπου σου*, as an obvious source for the variant text. In other words, it would be so easy for a *πρότερον* to be changed unthinkingly to *προ* *προσωπου*, whereas the reverse would be much more difficult to explain. Furthermore our text is fully acceptable; cf v. 19 and more particularly 2328.

342 *εἰς* 2°] *επι* B 15' 129 407 55 Co = Ra

The phrase *εἰς τὸ ὄρος* modifies *ἀναβήσῃ*. Whenever an indication of place to or on which someone goes up obtains in Exod, it is always represented by *ἐπί* or *εἰς*. The former obtains at 84 10₁₂ 17₁₀ 19₁₃ 20₂₆. In none of these does it represent the Hebrew preposition *ל*, which is what *℣* has at 342. Rather 84 19₁₃ have *ב*; 17₁₀ has no preposition at all, and 10₁₂ 20₂₆ have *על*. In 84 only *ἐπί* would be fitting, since the reference is to frogs coming up *on* you and *on* your servants and *on* your people.

The preposition *εἰς* occurs at 19₁₃ 12 24₁₂ 13 15 18 33₁ 34₁ 4; at 19₁₂ it renders *ב* in *℣*, and at 34₁ there is no Hebrew text equivalent; in all other instances *℣* has *ל*. It is safe then to conclude that Exod always rendered the preposition in the phrase *על* *ב* by *εἰς*, and not by *επι*.

3411 *ἀπό*] *προ* B O'-²⁹ ³⁷⁶ *b* 129-246 *n* 527 126-128'-407-628 55* 426 Latcod 103 Co = Ra
3424 *ἀπό*] *προ* B 15 407 55 426 = Ra

In both cases the preposition occurs in the phrase *ἀπὸ προσώπου* (σου / ὑμῶν) and modifies the verb *ἐκβαλ(λ)ω*. The Hebrew in both cases is מפניך. The verb *ἐκβάλλω* occurs 14 times in Exod, eight of which represent a מן construction of some kind and one לפניך. The relevant ones other than the above instances with variants on the prepositions are:

- 61 *ἐκ (τῆς γῆς αὐτοῦ)*] απο n = מן
 1011 *ἀπὸ προσώπου (Φαραώ)* = מאת פני
 1233 *ἐκ (τῆς γῆς)*] απο A 29 19' 121 68' 646 = מן
 2318 *ἀπὸ προσώπου σου*: non hab 𐤒
 2328 *ἀπὸ (+ προσώπου 407 Arm^{te}) σου* = מלפניך
 2329 *(αὐτοῦς) + (✱ Arm^{mss} Syh) απο προσώπου σου* O-58-15 C" f-56^{txt} 318 646 Arab
 Arm Syh = מפניך
 2330 *ἀπὸ σοῦ* = מפניך
 2331 *ἀπὸ σοῦ* = לפניך

Whenever פני is part of the prepositional phrase in the above cases (מאת, מפני, לפני) the preposition *ἀπό* is used and no other.

On the other hand, the phrase *πρὸ προσώπου* does occur elsewhere in Exod, though only three times. These are 2320 *ἐγὼ ἀποστέλλω . . . πρὸ προσώπου σου* (לפניך); 3234 *προπορεύσεται πρὸ προσώπου σου* (לפניך), and 346 *παρήλθεν . . . πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* (על פניך). From the above patterns of usage one is adequately justified in adopting *ἀπό* rather than *πρὸ* at 3411 24.

3621 *κατὰ τὰ ὀνόματα*] εκ (επι 376-767) των ονοματων B O-15 129 127 71' 55 Arab Arm Syh = Ra

It would seem that the reading of the variant text was an Origenian variant (though 𐤒 can hardly be cited in support of either Exod or the variant; it has על שמתם), since the pattern of support seems hex; note that O Arab Arm Syh all have the variant and only a few mss besides them. Of course the original hex text might well have been that of mss 376-767, with *επι* later “corrected” contextually to *εκ*.

3816 *ἐπ' 2°*] απ B* = Ra

One would hardly take this unique reading of B* seriously had not Ra adopted it. The preposition *ἐπ'* is certainly original. The candelabrum has seven sockets. Three are to the one side and three as their counterparts are on the other side (v. 15). The seventh one is now described as being *ἐπ' ἄκρου τοῦ λαμπαδίου ἐπὶ τῆς κορυφῆς ἄνωθεν*; it is the topmost one, the center one, on the top of its bowl, and it was wholly of solid gold. The reading of B is simply a scribal mistake.

M. Verbs

Occasionally the presence of two versions creates a situation whereby their texts mutually influence each other. This is particularly the case with the Decalogue.

202 *ὅστις ἐξήγαγόν*] ο εξαγαγων A F M^{txt} O'-72-15-29 C" d 30'-85^{mss} t x y 68'-128'-628 18 46 55 59 76' 424 426 509 Syh^{Lmss}; ex Deut 56; *οστις εξηγαγεν* M^{mss} 72-82 246* 458 85^{txt}-130-321-343' 120'

That the text of the Ten Words in the two versions of Deut 5 and Exod 20 should have mutually influenced each other is not surprising. The Deut text has *ὁ ἐξαγαγών* which strongly affected the text tradition of Exod, whereas the Exod text is also a well-represented variant in the Deut tradition. The reading *οστις ἐξηγαγεν* is palaeographically conditioned, i.e. an *ο/ε* confusion in the uncial form.

The influence of the Deut version is also clear in v.5 where the popular text is probably due to Deut rather than to $\mathfrak{M}$.

*ἔως — γενεᾶς] ἐπὶ (εὗς 318) τριτην (+ γενεαν 458) καὶ τεταρτην γενεαν (> 458) A F M^{txt}
376-οΙ⁷⁻⁸² Cⁿ b d n s t γ⁻⁵²⁷ 68' 18 46 55 59 76' 424 509: ex Deut 59; om καὶ τετάρτης
γενεᾶς M^{ms}*

$\mathfrak{M}$ has *על שלשים ועל רבעים* (Syh has *γενεαν* sub $\mathfrak{X}$, but this must be an error for the obelus), which is also that of Deut except for *ועל* for *על*. It is unlikely that the popular text was a correction based on the Hebrew; rather its source was the Deut text.

1. Participles as variants to finite verbs.

1230 *ἀνέστη]* *αναστας* B M^{ms} x = Ra
1237 *ἀπῆραν]* *απαρantes* B 707 552^{txt} 19' f n x 527 120-128' = Ra
147 *ἔλαβεν]* *λαβων* B 82' 129 x = Ra
1520 *ἔλαβεν]* *λαβουσα* B M^{ms} 707 b⁻³¹⁴ 56* 527 Syh^{Lms} = Ra
1618 *ἐμέτηρσαν]* *μετηρσαντες* A^(c) B 58'-82 19' f⁽⁻⁵³⁾ n 130 799 = Ra

Occasionally a paratactic clause in Hebrew is rendered by means of a subordinate participial clause, although these are relatively infrequent in Exod. Thus at 110 *καὶ ἐκπολεμήσαντες ἡμᾶς ἐξελεύσονται ἐκ τῆς γῆς* or at 22 *ιδόντες δὲ αὐτὸ ἀστεῖον ἐσκέπασαν αὐτό* obtain as perfectly good idiomatic Greek renderings of the Hebrew text.

Only rarely does the translator fail to compose grammatically correct participial clauses. In fact, I have found only the following.

815 *ιδὼν δὲ Φαραώ . . . ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδιά αὐτοῦ*
97 *ιδὼν δὲ Φαραώ . . . ἐβαρύνθη ἡ καρδιά Φαραώ*

In both cases the subject of the main clause is *καρδιά* rather than *Φαραώ*, but the sentences are not ambiguous. Really ambiguous is 25 *καὶ ἰδοῦσα τὴν θῆβιν . . . ἀποστείλασα τὴν ἄβραν ἀνείλατο αὐτήν*. Presumably the subject of the main verb is not the daughter of Pharaoh but rather *ἄβραν*, but this is just as uncertain as the original *πηρητι*.

At 3225 the participial construction *ιδὼν Μωυσῆς* is quite removed from the main verb, which does not come until v. 26 *ἔστη δὲ Μωυσῆς* with the subject repeated as in $\mathfrak{M}$. It can safely be concluded that the translator does not use the participial construction in anacoluthic fashion; for this he uses the genitive absolute construction. Exod is unlikely to have used the ambiguous participial constructions in the instances at the head of this note. It must be admitted that in the case of 147 the construction could be taken together with the preceding verse in which case it would not be anacoluthic, as e.g. 3213 *μνησθεῖς*. Such constructions are, however, highly unusual in Exod and the finite verb is certainly to be preferred.

2. Number.

- 57 *προσπεθήσεται*] *προσθ.* 707-708 14-52'-54-126-313'-551* *b*⁻⁵³⁷ *d*^{-106c} *x*; -*σετε* 135c-376; *προσθησεσθε* (-*σεσε* 458) *n*⁻⁶²⁸ 509; *προσθησετε* F^b 15-58'-426-οΙ⁻⁷⁰⁸ C'-14-25-414-422-551c 537 106c 628 *t* 121' 128' 646 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth; -*σεσθε* (-*σθαι* A 59*) A 527 68'-120' 59; *προσταθησεσθε* 76; *addetis* Arab Arm Co Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 58 *ἐπιβαλεῖς*] -*λειτε* (aut -*λειται*; -*λετε* 628) F M O'-29-135 C'-25-54-414'-422 *b d* 246 *n s t x* *y*⁻³⁹² 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$
- 58 *ἀφελεῖς*] -*λειτε* (aut -*λειται*; -*λετε* 458; -*λητε* 76) F M O'-72-29'-135 C'' *b d* 246 *n s t* 619*(cprm) *y*⁻³⁹² 128' 18 55 59 76' 130 646 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

The reference throughout is to the *ἐργοδιώκταις* and the *γραμματεῦσιν* of v.6. Throughout, reference to them as individuals, i.e. as second plural, is avoided. Why they should only be referred to as a class, i.e. in the singular, is not clear, but the support throughout is strong and it is difficult not to accept these references as original. This would mean that the popular variants with second person plural verbs throughout (note the solid hex support) were hebraizing corrections. This must be the case, since the reverse, viz. that original plural forms were changed to the singular, would be quite inexplicable.

- 77 *ἐλάλησεν*] *ελαλησαν* A M 29'-135-381'-426 25 *b d* 53'-246 127'-458c *t*⁻⁸⁴ *x y* 68'-128' 18 55 130 509 646' ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth Arm Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

The singular reading though contrary to $\mathfrak{M}$, is almost certainly original, since the singular would have only Aaron speak to Pharaoh rather than both Moses and Aaron. The translator commonly tries to "correct" minor discrepancies on matters which might seem contradictory, or, better put, he helps the reader avoid possible misinterpretations of the text which a more literal rendering might promote.

- 910 *ἔλαβεν*] -*βον* A 29'-58-82-426-οΙ C''⁻⁵⁴ 77 (414' 550'txt 761) *d n*⁽⁻⁷⁵⁾ *t*⁻⁸⁴ 121' 55 76' 130 509 646 799c Aeth^{-C} Arm Bo Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

V.8 stated *πασάτω Μωυσης*; in v.10 this is carried out. Exod made the account consistent by making the plural verb *יִקַּח* singular and omitting *וַיַּעֲמֵד* (later added by Origen as *καὶ ἐστησαν* in O-15 Pal Syh (sub ✕)). The entire account is then clear; it is Moses who takes ashes and scatters them towards heaven. There would be little point to both Moses and Aaron taking ashes, but only Moses doing the scattering. The variant text then corrected the text towards the Hebrew.

- 1921 *πέσωσιν*] *πεση* (aut -*σει*) A F M 29-426-οΙ C'' *d s t x y*⁻³¹⁸ 18 46 55 59 76' 509 ^{Lat}cod 104 Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

The word *πλήθος* as a collective could have either a singular or a plural predicate. Its only other occurrence as subject of a verb obtains in 126 *καὶ σφάζουσιν αὐτὸ πᾶν τὸ πλήθος*, where, however, $\mathfrak{M}$ has the plural verb, *וַיַּחַדּוּ*. Here the singular is probably an early (i.e. prehexaplaric) "correction" towards the Hebrew text. The original translator was much more adept in that earlier in the verse he had referred to *τῷ λαῷ*. This is then realized in the following *μήποτε* clause as a plural in *ἐγγίσωσιν*. Since the *καὶ πέσωσιν* clause is coordinate with it, the plural is used; this is also enhanced by the prepositional phrase modifier of the verb, *ἐξ αὐτῶν*. Thus according

to Exod *πληθος* should be viewed as a plural, and only a literalism over against the Hebrew text would change it to the singular.

2414 *εἶπαν*] *ειπεν* A F M oI-29 Cⁿ-126 422 d⁻⁴⁴ 127 t 318 68' 18 46 424 509 646 Lat^{cod} 102 Arab Bo Syh = *ℳ*

There is no doubt that the plural verb is Exod; it is consistent with the Greek tradition over against *ℳ*. In v. 13 Moses and Joshua stand up and Moses went up (*ייעל משה*); then in v. 14 it is only Moses who speaks (*אמר*), and in v. 15 Moses went up (*ייעל משה*). What is inconsistent about this account is the beginning: *ויקם משה ויהושע*. Exod has made all of this consistent by involving Joshua at all stages. In v. 13 both stand up and go up; in v. 14 the verb *אמר* is rendered by the plural.

In v. 15 both Moses and Joshua go up the mountain, Exod has *καὶ ἀνέβη Μωυσῆς καὶ Ἰησοῦς* which has been "corrected" by means of a popular variant:

2415 *καὶ Ἰησοῦς* B 82 f n⁻¹²⁷ 392 128'-407-628 76' 426 646' Aeth^C Bo^B] > rell = *ℳ*

A hebraizing correction has omitted *καὶ Ἰησοῦς* which results in a text consistent with *ℳ* and with vv. 16—18. In these verses in response to God's call from the top of the mountain only Moses continues the ascent in both *ℳ* and Exod.

2624 *ἔσονται* 1°] *εσται* B 129 55 = Ra

There is no good reason for a singular verb; it is simply a bad mistake. The reference can only be to the *δύο στύλους* intended for the rear corners of v. 23, and the singular is not possible. *ℳ* too is, of course, plural *ויהי* (or with some mss *והיו*). Ra adopted B's reading, but this must have been due to a lapse, since there is no possible singular referent in the vicinity. B's text may have been due to the later occurring *οὕτως ποιήσεις ἀμφοτέραις*, but it is nonetheless wrong.

309 *ἀνοίσεις* B^c 15' 129 799] *-σει* B* 53'-56 55; *-σεται* (cvar) A 58-376'-707-707^I C⁻⁷⁷-54-551 44 246 n⁻¹²⁷ 30 x 319 426 509 646; *-σετε* rell = *ℳ*

309 *σπείσεις* (σπισ. 129; *-σις* 82) B 15' 129] *ποιησεις* 55; *ποιησετε* 59; *σποιησεται* 75; *σπειρετε* b^{-537c}; *σπεισετε* (cvar) rell = *ℳ*

The Exod text is sparsely attested but it is quite certain that the singular is original, and that the plural is a hebraizing correction. The translator thought throughout the instructions concerning the building of the altar (vv. 1–10) that Moses was addressed rather than the people, and accordingly the singular second person occurs consistently. The inconsistency by which only v. 9 is in the plural is that of *ℳ*, and the translator smoothes out the text by making it regularly singular. This is quite characteristic of his work; it is an interpretation in which minor inconsistencies are removed, and possible contradictions leveled. Later revisers in their reverence for the Hebrew text leveled out the differences between LXX and their text and reintroduced the plural.

324 *εἶπεν* B F 72-767^c 14-52-73-414'-615^c-761 d 53' t 527 68'-120' 55 509 Aeth^C Bo] *ειπον* F^b 381'-707-767* 246 n⁻⁴⁵⁸; *ειπ* 458; *ειπαν* F^a rell = *ℳ*

The number of this verb cannot be determined for Exod in isolation but must be seen together with vv. 5—6. In v. 4 it is Aaron who received the gold, fashioned it as

a molten calf and said (*εἶπεν*): These are your gods According to v. 5 (both *ℳ* and Exod) Aaron then built an altar before it and proclaimed a religious festival for the next day. In v. 6 Exod consistently has Aaron rising early, offering up holocausts and presenting a peace offering. Thereafter the people sit down. *ℳ* has the verbs for rising early, offering up, and presenting, all in the plural; presumably the people are meant. Exod with its consistent number pattern paints a rather darker picture of Aaron than does *ℳ*. In view of this consistency extending to vv. 5 and 6, it is clear that *εἶπεν* in v. 4 is original, and the popularly supported plural verb is a hebraizing correction, not at all necessarily hex, in fact, probably much earlier.

3316 *ἐνδοξασθησόμεθα*] -σομαι B^(ms) M^{txt} 73'-550'-551 108* f⁻¹²⁹ 68' 18 55 = Ra

ℳ has נפלינו. When *ℳ* has a compound subject as here, אני ועמך, the preceding verb can either agree with the first element alone, i.e. in the singular, or with the compound subject in the plural. Exod usually follows whatever the parent text does. Since there is no question about the parent text being other than *ℳ* here, it seems likely that the singular is a secondary variant. It might also be noted that original B has left out by parablepsis due to homoioteleuton the part of this verse which includes this entire clause, considerably lessening the support for the variant thereby. The singular variant simply arose by attraction to the immediately following *ἐγώ*.

398 *ἐποίησεν* B F^h C^{''-14} 246 n s⁻³⁰ 799 Lat^{codd} 100 103 Aeth Arab] -σαν rel

The plural variant is an old reading already attested in the time of Origen, since he apparently retained it in spite of the fact that *ℳ* has the singular. It is, however, secondary, probably derived from the plural *ἐποίησαν* of v. 6. Furthermore v. 11 speaks of the Israelites *ἐποίησαν* as well. The subject throughout is *Βεσελεήλ* of 381, often referred to as *οὗτος* (last reference 3836).

3. Congruence with neuter plural subjects.

3822 *ἦν*] *ῆσαν* (*εισαν* 619) B O-15' 19' d 129 n t x 68'-120' 55 426 = Ra

The subject of the verb is *ἄ*, of which the antecedent is *πυρείων*. Exod almost always follows the classical rules of congruence between the neuter plural subject and the singular verb. Note the following list.

- 59 βαρυνέσθω τὰ ἔργα
- 96 ἐτελεύτησεν πάντα τὰ κτήνη
- 911 ἐγένετο γὰρ τὰ ἔλκη
- 919 τὰ κτήνη ὅσα ἂν εὗρεθῇ . . . καὶ μὴ εἰσέλθῃ
- 101 ἐπέλθῃ τὰ σημεῖα ταῦτα
- 1026 τὰ κτήνη ἡμῶν πορεύσεται
- 158 ἐπάγῃ ὥσει τείχος τὰ ὕδατα
- 158 ἐπάγῃ τὰ κύματα
- 1514 ἤκουσαν ἔθνη καὶ ὠργίσθησαν
- 214 . . . τὰ παιδιά ἔσται
- 2128 οὐ βρωθήσεται τὰ κρέα
- 238 τὰ γὰρ δῶρα ἐκτυφλοῖ
- 2311 ἔδεται τὰ θηρία τὰ ἄγρια

23²⁹ πολλὰ γένηται ἐπὶ σὲ τὰ θηρία
 25¹⁹ ἔσονται τὰ πρόσωπα
 25³⁰ . . . καὶ τὰ κρίνα ἐξ αὐτῆς ἔσται
 27² ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔσται τὰ κέρατα
 29¹ ταῦτά ἐστιν
 29³⁴ τὰ λοιπά . . . οὐ βρωθήσεται
 29³⁸ ταῦτά ἐστιν
 30² ἔσται τὰ κέρατα
 30²⁹ ἔσται ἄγια
 33¹⁶ τὰ ἔθνη ὅσα ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἐστὶν
 34¹ τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἦν
 34¹⁰ ἐνδοξα ἃ οὐ γέγονεν
 34¹⁰ τὰ ἔργα κυρίου ὅτι θαυμαστά ἐστὶν
 34²⁵ οὐ κοιμηθήσεται . . . θύματα
 35²⁴ εὐρέθη ξύλα ἄσηπτα
 36⁷ τὰ ἔργα ἦν
 36¹⁰ ἐτιμήθη τὰ πέταλα
 38¹⁶ τὰ λαμπάδια αὐτῶν ἃ ἐστὶν
 39⁴ ἐγενήθη τὰ ἑκατὸν τάλαντα

Of the 32 instances in the list only two, 15¹⁴ and 25¹⁹, have plural verbs as predicates of neuter plural subjects, and it would seem likely that ἦν is original text at 38²² as well.

4. Only one instance of change in person occurs which merits some discussion.

33³ εἰσάξει] εισαξω (εξαξω 767) B F*(cprm) O^{-376-15' 73'-550'} 129 n 71' 68'-120' 646 Arm^{ap} Bo^A Sa Syh = Ra

Exod has introduced καὶ εἰσάξει σε before εἰς γῆν ῥέουσιν γάλα καὶ μέλι, although **ℳ** does not have it. According to **ℳ** it is God himself who will drive out the nations, presumably by means of the messenger into a land, an ellipsis which Exod explains. The explanation may well be what **ℳ** meant. That εισαξω could not be Exod is clear from the continuation of the text: οὐ γὰρ μὴ συναναβῶ μετὰ σοῦ, i.e. an εισαξω introduction would introduce a blatant contradiction into the text. The variant is based on an unreflecting attempt to make the subject of the verb the same throughout the verse: εισαξω, συναναβῶ and ἐξαναλώσω, but it is quite wrong.

5. Tense.

2³ ἡδύναντο] εδυναντο A F M O^{-72 82 381*} 106 t 121' z 509

Augment for secondary tenses for δύναιμι in Exod is ἡ- which accords with early Ptolemaic usage; cf Mayser I 2.94. Note also the other occurrences in Exod along with ἐ- variants in the following list.

7²¹ ἡδύναντο] εδυναντο 64'-426 106 127 t x 128'
 7²⁴ ἡδύναντο] εδυναντο M 15-64^{txt}-426-708 25-52'-54-57-313 44 127 321 128' 55
 8¹⁸ ἡδύναντο] εδυναντο A F 15-64*-426-708 C^{-77 413 500}-25-52'-54-313' 44' 127 t 121;
 εδυνοντο 413 75
 9¹¹ ἡδύναντο] εδυναντο 15-64'-426-707* 44' 458' 321^c t 121 128'
 12³⁹ ἡδυνήθησαν] εδυνηθησαν (aut -νασθ.) A 44 127 30-321 t⁻⁸⁴ x 121-527 68'

1523 ἡδύναντο] *εδυναντο* A F 64'-426 44' n⁻⁷⁵ 85 74' 59
 4029 ἡδυνήθη] *εδυνήθη* 376 d⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ 127 74'; *εδυνασθη* G-15-58

1822 *κουφιουσιν*] *κουφισουσιν* (-*φησουσιν* 707 761) A 58'-707-708 Cⁿ⁻¹²⁶ b

The Attic future is everywhere used in Exod for -*ιζω* verbs but not for -*αζω* or for -*εζω*. Other evidence for the -*ιζω* verbs changing to -*ισω* in the text tradition is as follows: 242 *ἐγγιεῖ*] *εγγιση* 55; 242 *ἐγγιουσιν*] *εγγισουσιν* 55; 2633 *διοριεῖ*] *διορισεις* 129 55; 2924 *ἀφοριεῖς*] *αφορισει* 59; 2926 *ἀφοριεῖς*] *αφορισεις* 68'-120'; 2936 *καθαριεῖς*] *καθαρισεις* (-*σης* 59*) F 15*(cprm) 54-414' 71' 59; 2937 *καθαριεῖς*] *καθαρισεις* O⁻³⁷⁶; 3010 *καθαριεῖ*] *καθαρισει* (-*ρησει* 75^c) 707 n⁻¹²⁷ 30'-343' 121 59. For 1215 *ἀφαινεῖτε*, 159 *μεριῶ*, 1912 *ἀφοριεῖς*, 2216 *φερνειῖ* and 347 *καθαριεῖ* all witnesses have the Attic future. The tradition is remarkably consistent in avoiding the -*ισω* futures, particularly in view of their prevalence by the time of the N.T.

17 *κατίσχυον* (-*χιον* 321) B 72-426-707 73-413 b f^{-56*} n⁻⁶²⁸ s 55 646] *-χυσαν* rell

The imperfect is particularly fitting here since it is the process of growth which is being emphasized; note how it is modified by the adverb *σφόδρα σφόδρα*. The fact that the majority of witnesses have the aorist does not mean that it is the preferable reading at all. The aorist variant is the result of the influence of the immediate context. The verb is the last in a list of aorist verbs presented coordinately: *ἠϋξήθησαν καὶ ἐπληθύνθησαν καὶ χυδαῖοι ἐγένοντο*. These are all properly aorist, i.e. neutral in aspect, whereas the concluding *κατίσχυον* is imperfect. Cf also v. 12 where *ἴσχυον* occurs but there without aorist variants.

24 *κατεσκόπευεν*] *-πενσεν* (-*πενεν* 14; *απεσκ.* 321^{mg}; *απεσκοπεσεν* 30) O⁻⁴²⁶-618 Cⁿ⁻⁷³ 19 610 53' 628 s⁻⁷³⁰ x 59 646

The translator shows a fine exegetical sense in his use of the imperfect and its continuous character. This is particularly the case here where the sister was watching the basket which contained her baby brother. For this feeling for the use of the imperfect compare for ch. 1 *ἐταπείνουν* (12), *ἐγίνοντο* (12), *ἴσχυον* (12), *ἐβδελύσσοντο* (12), *κατεδυνάστευον* (13), *κατωδύνων* (14), *κατεδουλοῦντο* (14), *ἐζωογονοῦν* (17), *ἐζωογονεῖτε* (18), *ἔτικτον* (19), *ἐποίει* (20), *ἐπλήθυνεν* (20), *ἴσχυεν* (20), and *ἐφοβοῦντο* (21).

31 *ἤγαγεν*] *ἤγεν* A F M O'-135-707 Cⁿ 19' 56* s x 527 18 59 76' 509 799 Syh

The aorist is demanded by the context, since the following clause has *καὶ ἦλθεν*. Moses was accustomed to shepherding (*ἦν ποιμαίνων*) the sheep of his father-in-law, and on the occasion which this statement introduces "brought the sheep . . . and came to Mount Horeb." The imperfect would be quite incorrect, and the popular variant is palaeographically inspired.

52 *ἐξαποστέλλω*] *-στελω* O⁻¹⁵ 29* 58 77-78-126-550 b 53*-56'-129 n⁻⁴⁵⁸ s^{-321mg} x 121' 18 59* 76' L^acod 100 Aeth Arab Co; *αποστελλω* 120'-128; *αποστελω* 106 630

Ⲙ has the imperfect ⲙⲗⲥⲱ and the future was certainly intended. The translator here used the present for stylistic reasons. It should be noted that Exod continues

with *καὶ λέγουσιν αὐτῷ* for *וַיֹּאמְרוּ*, i. e. another present tense inflection. Since this represents dialogue, the translator has adopted a lively style to bring out and enhance the tension inherent in the interchange. The popular variant in the future is a pedantic correction not necessarily due to Hebrew influence but simply to the context. It was of course made easy since it simply involved the haplography of a *lambda*.

108 *λατρεύσατε*] -σετε 129 84; -ρευετε (aut -ται) 29' d 246 127' 85' 46-74-370 392 130 509

The aorist imperative rather than the present indicative, is original. In fact, whenever *לך/לך* is rendered by an imperative it is in the present (*πορεύου* / -εσθε, *βάδιζε* / -ζετε), whereas the verb following asyndetically is in the aorist. In two instances the attraction of the tense of the introductory verb has been so strong in the tradition as to constitute a majority variant:

1024 *λατρεύσατε* (-ται 376) A B 376-708*(vid) 54-550' 121 68' 59] -ρευστ 126; -σετε 106; -ρευετε (c var) rel

1231 *λατρεύσατε* (-ται 376) B 376 54 19' 75 x 59] -σετε 527; > 343^{xt}; -ρευετε rel

1016 *κατέσπευσεν*] *κατεσπευδε*(ν) A B 15-29-135 422 f²⁴⁶ 30-85'-343c-344 68* 59 130^{cpr m} 799 = Ra; *εσπευδε* 126

The Hebrew has the word *וימהר* and the aorist is the expected form. The translator used the aorist throughout for past narrative, only using the perfect and the imperfect when their aspectual nuances fitted. Here the imperfect does not fit and in spite of the support by the two oldest extant mss must be secondary. The variant may well have been impelled palaeographically; the next word is *δέ* and it may well have influenced some scribe to write -δεν for -σεν. In any case, the aorist must be Exod.

1024 *ὑπολείπεσθε*] -λιπεσθε B 426 25-52'-54-57'-73'-313' 128' 76 130 646 Cyr Ad 204 = Ra

The variant text is itacistic and should not be considered a genuine aorist. Pharaoh is ordering Moses and Aaron to perform their cultic duties but to leave behind their cattle. The present imperative is the more appropriate aspect and this kind of careful distinction is characteristic of the translator.

1225 *φυλάξεσθε*] -ξασθε (aut -σθαι) A Oⁿ⁻⁷² 135 381' Cⁿ⁻¹⁴ b d⁻¹⁰⁶ f 619 318 120-128' 18 59 76' 130 509 799 Aeth; -ξησθε 72 106; -ξετε n

The future rather than the popular aorist imperative is Exod. Whenever a Hebrew apodosis is introduced by a *waw* plus perfect, Exod renders it by a future, with but two exceptions: 116 where *וַחִיה* is rendered by *περιποιεῖσθε*, and 223 where *וַיִּמְכֹּר* is translated by *πραθήτω*. This is true not only of narrative but also of legal materials.

145 *πεποιήκαμεν*] *εποιησαμεν* B 82 129 127* 120-128'-628 = Ra

The perfect tense is obviously the correct one since the context refers to the ongoing effect of their action. The Egyptians had sent the Israelites away *τοῦ μὴ δουλεύειν ἡμῖν*, i. e. the departure of the Israelites has the lasting effect of the Israelites no longer being in their service. The variant text would hardly be taken seriously as a

possibly original text, were it not for the support of B; it is, however, the result of some inattentive scribe accustomed to writing aorists, which is after all the dominant tense used in narration.

1525 ἐπείρασεν B 58-82 56'-129 127 71 527 z 130 Arm Bo] *επειραζεν* *rell*

The aorist is probably original in spite of its weak support. Within the verse there are six verbal clauses all of which have aorist inflection. More particularly, the clause in which the verb occurs, *καὶ ἐκεῖ ἐπείρασεν αὐτόν*, is coordinated with the immediately preceding clause *ἐκεῖ ἔθετο αὐτῷ δικαιώματα καὶ κρίσεις*. The two are clearly parallel as the repeated *ἐκεῖ* shows. The popular variant may have been due to an attempt to link the clause with the next verse, which refers to hearing Yahweh's voice and being obedient to his laws, an ongoing demand, and thus promoting an imperfect tense interpretation. The reference is, however, to the Marah event recorded in the immediately preceding verses.

1711 ἐγένετο] *εγινετο* (*εγειν*. B* F) A B F Fb *oI*⁻⁷⁰⁷ C'^{-552 739}-25-54-414'-422 127 130^{mg} t 55 76' 646 Arm = Ra

ℳ has a narrative perfect, i.e. with *ωαω*: ויהי. This occurs 62 times in ℳ. It is most commonly rendered by *καὶ ἔσται* (31 times). Since it is often simply an introductory formula introducing a dependent clause as in 1711 (*καὶ ἐγένετο ὅταν . . .*), it is often (15 times) simply omitted, i.e. either entirely omitted or simply represented by a conjunction. Other renderings are *καὶ ἔσομαι* 67 2945; *καὶ ἔσονται* 816 2224 2625 304; *καὶ γενηθήτω* 99(1°); *καὶ ἔστωσαν* 1911 277; *ἔσται δέ* 275; *ἔσεσθε* 195; *ἔσονται* 2519; *καὶ ἐγένετο* 719 337, and *καὶ ἔξει* 2839. It will be noted that on two occasions (719 337) the context is past tense as in 1711 and therefore *καὶ ἐγένετο* is used.

Since the context in 1711 requires past tense, it would be helpful to examine the renderings of the preterite tense in narration as well, especially when it is used in formulaic fashion. The word ויהי (or ויהיו) occurs 46 times in Exodus. The most common rendering is *καὶ ἐγένετο* (or *ἐγένετο δέ*) which occurs 17 times, and the plural equivalent four times. It is left untranslated 12 times. Instead of *ἐγένετο* the passive *ἐγενήθη* (with *καί* or *δέ*) is used five times. The word *ἐγένετο* without a conjunction is found at 152. The verb "to be," i.e. ἦν, ἦσαν, obtains five times. Only twice is the imperfect of *γίνομαι* to be found (1916 19), but in neither case is the verb used as a formula. In the description of the theophany the thundering and the lightning flashes as well as the blasts on the trumpet were present; obviously the imperfect tense correctly interprets the intent of the description.

At 1711 this is not the case, since it introduces a *ὅταν* clause, and the translator never uses the imperfect in such a context. The early variant reading is probably due to the influence of imperfect verbs in the context; note the double occurrence of the imperfect *κατίσχυεν* with real sensitivity for the narrative flow.

1916 ἐγίνοντο] *εγενοντο* F 29'-72-376-708 C'' 537 *d*⁻⁴⁴ *f*^{-56*} n s 84 318-527 z 509 799 Co

That *ἐγίνοντο* is original rather than the aorist is likely, though the distinction between the two is not particularly evident. Since the aorist is extremely common, the

more unusual imperfect, which after all fits into the context very well, and is supported by the oldest witnesses, B and A, is to be preferred.

2837 *ἱερατεύουσίν]* *ἱερατευωσιν* B 707 108-314 44 74 = Ra

The overwhelming support for the aorist rather than for the present subjunctive should be decisive here. Either form makes sense, but in view of the fact that only a few mss support the present it seems prudent to view it as the result of scribal inattentiveness. The present subjunctive is used sparingly in Exod and the more common aorist is almost certainly original here.

314 *ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν]* *-νῆσαι* (cvar) B O-15'-707^I n 71' 392 426 = Ra

The question as to whether the present or the aorist infinitive is to be preferred can only be decided on the basis of the context. The relevant context reads *διανοεῖσθαι καὶ ἀρχιτεκτονεῖν ἐργάζεσθαι*. All three infinitives are present, not aorist. This also makes good sense from a semantic point of view. In general, it may be said that the aspectually neutral aorist infinitive is far more frequently used than the present; in fact, the present would be used only when the translator wanted to call attention to the continuity of the verbal idea. That is precisely the case here. Beseleel is to keep in mind and to be designing to be working gold and silver, etc. The variant probably arose simply because the aorist is, all things being equal, the more common form, but here it is clearly secondary.

316 *δέδωκα* 1°] *εδωκα* B 15' 319 = Ra
— *δέδωκα* 2°] *εδωκα* 58'-64*-707^I C''-414'

The perfect and the aorist of *δίδωμι* are easily confused and the weakly supported aorist is probably secondary. In fact, the perfect form occurs in the coordinate second clause as well, but in that case Ra adopted the perfect. Both clauses refer to what God has done with continued effect. He has given him (Beseleel) a fellow artist, and has endowed him with understanding, so that they will do everything as ordered. The perfect exactly fits the intent of both clauses; *δέδωκα* is correct in both instances.

3111 *ἐντετελάμην]* *εντεταλμαι* A oI-707 b 527; *εντελλομαι* (cvar) F^b M 29-767 C'' d n s t y z 18 46 59 319 426 509; *praecipiam* Aeth Bo

That the aorist is the original text seems clear, though the perfect might be possible. The perfect does occur at 3418 for the Hebrew perfect (*צויתך*). Elsewhere (12 times) the aorist obtains to render the perfect of the root *צוה* (always in a subordinate clause except at 3432). The present tense occurs only twice; at 72 *σοι ἐντέλλομαι* renders *אצוֹךְ*, and at 3411 *ἐγὼ ἐντέλλομαί σοι* corresponds to *אנכי מצוֹךְ*. Here *צויתך*, and a past tense is mandatory. The popular variant probably arose because the verb is preceded by *ἐγὼ*. The pattern *ἐγὼ* plus a first singular present tense verb is fairly common in the Pentateuch as a rendering for *אני/אנכי* plus a participle; cf 3411 supra. Though *ἐγὼ* has no specific counterpart in *אנכי*, the translator intended it

to emphasize that God himself is the subject of the tabernacle pattern commanded to Moses which they (Beseleel and Eliab) are to carry out.

3234 προπορεύεται] προπορευεται B F 15-72-oI C-77 19 56-129 130 318' 319 Syh = Ra

The promise is for the future as the imperfect $\alpha\upsilon$ shows. The Hebrew imperfect is almost invariably rendered by the future in Exod and there is no good reason to accept a present tense verb here. The variant text is based on an uncial parent text in which the *sigma* and *epsilon* are very similar; i.e. it is an error palaeographically inspired.

3315 λέγει B F^b O-15' 73'-550' b 129 n 126-128'-407-628] ειπεν rel

There seems to be no rhyme or reason for the use of the historical present which the translator occasionally uses. In fact, he used λέγει 22 times of which almost one-third (seven instances) occur in chh. 32 and 33. Nor is there certainty as to the original text in these cases when ειπεν is a substantially supported variant, but it is far more likely that an original λέγει be changed to ειπεν, since ειπεν occurs monotonously often in Exod, than that an original ειπεν be changed to λεγει. In fact, a λεγει variant hardly ever obtains for an original ειπεν, and when it does it receives very sparse support. Ra was certainly correct in following the λέγει of B.

6. Mood.

48 πιστεύουσιν] -σωσι(ν) A M O'-15 (135) 426-618 C-77 739-25-73-126-413-761 b 44 56'-129 n 30-343 84-134 x γ-121 120* 18 55 59 130 319 509 799

The subjunctive cannot be correct here, since the apodosis of the conditional sentence begins with this verb, and only the future can be correct. The subjunctive was probably introduced under the influence of πιστεύωσιν which is part of the protasis.

826 θύσωμεν 1°] θυσομεν B 15'-29^c-58(mg)-135-426-oI 16-25-52-57-73'-126^c-414'-422-550'-615^c-739 106 321 74-370 121-527 407-630 76^c 130 646 = Ra

Since *omicron* and *omega* were pronounced alike, confusion among the scribes was rife whenever as here either the future indicative or the aorist subjunctive made good sense. That the confusion is scribal rather than a real variant is clear from the scattered support: no group (except oI) is complete. Furthermore one should not rate codex B any higher than the later mss in this matter.

The subjunctive spelling is exegetically preferable since the statement seems to be one of intent, i.e. "we would sacrifice" rather than "we shall sacrifice." It is a potential action that is being portrayed in the response to Pharaoh, not a statement of future fact. This interpretation is further enhanced by the rendering of the last part of the verse by a future more vivid conditional sentence, rather than a temporal condition in the indicative.

On the other hand, this nicely contrasts with v. 27 where the statement is indeed in

the future, i.e. "we shall go for a three-day journey into the desert and sacrifice." There Ra quite rightly adopted the future *θύσομεν* rather than the aorist subjunctive read by many witnesses.

1311 *δῶ*] *δωσει* (cvar) B F^b 15'-58-376^c-707^c 52'-73'-77-413-761 19' *f*⁻⁵³ 75 134 x 318 120 55^c 59 76' 130 = Ra; *δωει* 72; *δωη* 551^c 121 68'; *δωσω* F 376* C⁻⁷⁷-25-54-57-313-414-422-550' 30-85-343' 527 18 424

Only *δῶ* can be seriously considered as critical text. The popular future which Ra adopted on the basis of B makes the clause *καὶ δώσει σοὶ αὐτήν* the apodosis, whereas it is only v. 12 which constitutes Yahweh's demand that all first born be dedicated to him. The clause *καὶ δῶ σοὶ αὐτήν* is coordinate with the conditional (*ὥς ἂν*) *εἰσαγάγῃ σε κύριος . . . εἰς τὴν γῆν*. The Hebrew לך ונתנה has a different word order from the Greek. Since the translator used *σοὶ αὐτήν* rather than *αὐτήν σοι*, it was easy to repeat *σοι* after *δῶ* thereby creating *δώσει σοι*.

2120 *ἐκδικηθήτω*] *-θησεται* A F M Oⁿ-58 82 Cⁿ 19' *d* s^{-130mg} t x γ⁻³⁹² 68' 18 46 55 59 76' 424 509 646'

The verb in *℣* is preceded by a cognate free infinitive. In a legal context such verbal phrases are commonly translated in Exod by an imperative rather than a future indicative form. When no cognate infinitive obtains the verb is indeed usually in the future. Since this is the majority pattern in this legal section (cf e.g. v. 21 where *ἐκδικηθήσεται* actually occurs in Exod), it is not surprising that the tradition should generate the future indicative also in those few contexts where it is not original.

2123 *ἦ*] *ην* B 82 *f*⁻²⁴⁶ 458 321* 319 799 = Ra

The imperfect is simply a mistake, and if it were not found in B, it would not occur to anyone to take it seriously. Whenever Exod has a verb in a protasis introduced by *ἐάν*, it is always in the subjunctive, and there is no reason to consider this verse to be an exception.

2211 *οὐ μὴ ἀποτίσῃ*] *οὐκ αποτ(ε)ισει* B 15-29-707^c 527 319^c(vid) = Ra

It is quite true that the legal requirement to repay or not to repay is usually in the future indicative. There is, however, no perceptible semantic distinction between Exod and the variant text adopted by Ra. Since the variant text is supported extremely weakly, it is probable that it is simply due to the influence of v. 13, and that the *οὐ μὴ* plus subjunctive as the more unusual construction is to be preferred as original text.

335 *ἐπαγάγω*] *εγω* (> 75' 509) *επαγω* A 29 75' 121 68'-120' 46 509; *εγω* (> 59) *επαξω* b d t 392 126-128'-628 59 799; *επαξω εγω* B *f*⁻¹²⁹ = Ra; *επαναγαγων* 527; pr *εγω* F oI-82 C⁻⁵⁷ s 318 319 646; *επαναγων* 426; *επαγαγων* 15-707 73'-550' 55 Latcod 100; inportans Latcod 104

That the reading adopted by Ra is secondary is easily demonstrable. The usage of *ἐγώ* with the inflected verb occurs 38 times in Exod (excluding *ἐγώ εἰμι*), but it never follows the verb. It may be perfectly good Greek, but Exod does not have it. In fact,

of the 38 occurrences it occurs only before a verb in the indicative mood (present, future or aorist tenses), and never in the subjunctive as would be the case here. So it is most unlikely that *εγω* is original, even if it precedes the verb.

Both *ἐπαγάγω* and *επαξω* are equally valid renderings; both are aorist subjunctives of *ἐπάγω*. The sigmatic aorist of *ἄγω* does appear in the LXX (cf Helbing 90), though the second aorist *ἤγαγον* is the more usual. For its appearance in the papyri cf Mayser I 2.144; it does become more popular in post-Classical times. In the tradition it appears without the secondary *εγω* only in ms 59, and it seems likely that the more common *ἐπαγάγω* is the original Exod text.

3311 *λαλήσαι*] -σει B 15-708^c 16-131^c 106-125 53'-129 127 x⁻⁷¹ 407 46 55 59 426 646 = Ra

Why Ra should have adopted a future indicative form when the context demands some potential inflection is difficult to see; only an exaggerated reverence for the text of B could impel one to adopt the variant text. The aorist optative fits the sense exactly, since the conditional nature of the clause is introduced by *ὥς εἴ* (*τις*), i. e. "as though someone would speak."

7. Voice.

124 *συναριθμήσετε* Wa.] -σεται A B 19 44-125' 127 t⁻⁸⁴ z⁻¹²⁸ 76' 424 = Ra; *αριθμηθησεται* 72; -μηθησεται (*καταρ.* 53') rell

Wa. (61, 105) is quite correct in taking the reading of A B+ as an itacistic error for the active second plural which exactly equals *𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤕*. I would argue the matter somewhat differently, however. A good case could be made for the popular passive, since that would reasonably represent the intent of the Hebrew text. In fact, Exod has reshaped the verse both lexemically and syntactically rather differently from *𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤕*, and the passive would fit this general pattern. On the other hand, there is substantial support for Walter's reconstruction in the A B+ reading. After all, the middle voice does not fit the context at all well, and the second plural active must be intended; in other words, the A B+ reading is simply itacistic.

1210 *ἀπολείψετε*] -ψεσθε A; -ψεται B 58 370* 509 121 122* 319 509; *υπολ.* M 64^c-135 57'^{ms} 537 56* 85^{ms}-344^{ms} 392 128' 130; *υπολείψεται* 72-οΙ⁻⁶⁴ b⁻⁵³⁷ 343 x 318 18 799; *υπολείψεσθαι* 707; *καταλ.* C-25-57'^{txt}-73-78^c-126-313-414'-422-550' 53'-56^c-129 127-628 85^{txt}-321-344^{txt}-730 646; *καταλείψεται* 52'-54-78*-761 246 75 30 55 59; *καταλείψεσθαι* 458

In view of *תותיר* in *𐤒𐤕𐤓𐤕* the second person plural inflection must be correct and the -*ται* endings arose itacistically. The question that remains is that of the correct compound for Exod. All three compounds occur in Exod, though *ἀπολ.* least of all. All occur with approximately the same meaning, and it seems judicious to rely on the oldest witnesses. Codices A and B both witness to the *ἀπο-* compound, and Ra was probably correct in adopting *ἀπολείψετε* as his text.

1216 *ποιήσεται*] -σετε B M 58-οΙ⁻⁸² 707* 708 C^{"-14'} 52 54 131 313'* 118-537 44'-125 56-129^c-664 127^c-628 s⁻³⁰ t x y z⁻¹²⁰ 18 55 59 76 130 799; -σητε 19; -ση^τ 72

℞ has $\pi\omega\gamma$ vocalized as a Niphal. The popular variant adopted by Ra is a homonym and easily replaced the original text. This process was accelerated by the well-known prohibition of Lev 23 (also found in Num 28 and 29) $\pi\tilde{\alpha}\nu \xi\rho\gamma\omicron\nu \lambda\alpha\tau\rho\epsilon\nu\tau\acute{o}\nu \omicron\upsilon \pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$. The second active plural and the third singular middle are homonymous, but a glance at the Hebrew is decisive.

30₃₂ $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$] $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ F^b M O⁻³⁷⁶-29 118'-537 s^{-30'} t x y z^{-120 126} 18 46 59 Lat^{cod} 100 verss = Ra ℞; $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ B 15' C'' f⁻¹²⁹ 30' 646

It is perfectly true that ℞ has the second plural verb $\pi\omega\gamma\eta$ and at first blush it might seem obvious that $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ was the original text. But the translation must be seen in context. Throughout this entire chapter it is Moses who is commanded, and the second person verbs are throughout singular as a result, regardless of what ℞ has. What the translator does allow is plural second personal pronouns, such as $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ and $\gamma\epsilon\nu\epsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma \upsilon\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$ in v.31, and $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\alpha\iota \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ in vv.32 36 37.

Here the translator follows his format by taking an impersonal medio-passive verb and adding $\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$, which is his way of rendering a plural which does not fit his pattern. He did exactly the same thing in v.37, where, however, ℞ does add $\delta\lambda\lambda$ to the plural verb.

v.37 $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ A B 72*-82'-376-707¹ 54-739* 44 f⁻¹²⁹ 120-628 55 319 426^c 509 799] - $\sigma\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ 426*; $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\theta\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$ 15-767 52'-313'-550* 129 n⁻¹²⁷; $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\tau$ 126; $\pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ rell = Ra ℞

Here too the same context obtains: $\kappa\alpha\tau\grave{\alpha} \tau\eta\nu \sigma\acute{\upsilon}\nu\nu\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\nu \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\nu \omicron\upsilon \pi\omicron\iota\eta\sigma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota \upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\nu \acute{\epsilon}\alpha\nu\tau\omicron\iota\varsigma$, and the translator consistently avoids any plural second person verb in exactly the same way.

8. There is some confusion in the tradition about the inflection of the aorist passive of $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$. This is reflected in the following instance:

40₂₉ $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$] $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$ B 129 55 = Ra; $\epsilon\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$ G-15-58; - $\nu\alpha\sigma\tau\eta$ 19'

There is very little basis for making a choice between the - $\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$ and the - $\eta\theta\eta$ ending, since both are good classical forms with ancient attestations (cf LS sub $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\mu\alpha\iota$), and both are also well-attested in the Ptolemaic papyri (Mayser I 2.94). The same choice is given at 12₃₉: $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$] - $\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ M 82' 56-129 85 392 120-128' 18 319; $\epsilon\delta\upsilon\nu\alpha\sigma\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ A 30-321 x 121-527 68'.

It will be noted that B 55 both support the lemma at 12₃₉. Though both are fully possible forms and occur throughout the LXX, one would presume that a translator probably used the one or the other consistently rather than mixing them up (the mixture is the result of scribal activity!); since the - $\eta\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\nu$ was adopted at 12₃₉ it would be sensible to choose $\eta\delta\upsilon\nu\eta\theta\eta$ at 40₂₉ as well, particularly in view of the weak support for an - $\alpha\sigma\theta\eta$ inflection.

9. Hellenistic versus Classical inflections.

For the root *ειπ-* Exod always uses the Hellenistic *εἶπαν* for the third plural forms. The following list gives all the evidence.

- 1¹⁹ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* F^b 15-72-376-381' 422 *b d* 246 *n t* 527 128 76; *ειπε(ν)* 71 59*
 2¹⁹ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458) A F O⁻⁴²⁶-29'-82*-135-618 78-126* 19' *d* 53'-246 75' *s* 318-527 *z* 59 76' 130 509
 5¹ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458; -*πεν* 19-314* 56' 392) F^b 72-376-381'-707 *b*⁻¹⁰⁸ *d f*⁻¹²⁹ *n* 84 527 392* 76 646
 5²¹ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458; -*πεν* A 19 610 30 509) A F^b 72-376-381' *b d f n* 30 *x* 318-527 76 509
 8¹⁹ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458) F^b 72-376-381' 78 *d* 53' *n* 318-527 128' 18 76'
 10³ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458; -*πων* 246^c; -*πεν* 761 314 127) 72-376-381' 126-761* 118'-537 *d* 246 *n* 619 527 18 76' 509
 12³³ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* F^b 72-82'-376-381' 118'-537 *d n*⁻¹²⁷ *t* 527 76
 14⁵ *εἶπαν* B M^{ms} 58-426-oII⁻¹³⁵ 19' 129 30' *x* 120-128'-628 130 799] *ειπεν* 135 392 Aeth^{-C}; *ειπ*^π 458; *ειπον* (-*πων* 376) *rell*
 15¹ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (-*πων* 46; -*πεν* 15 85' 318 509) 15-376-381'-707 57 118'-537 *d*⁽⁻¹²⁵⁾ *f*⁻¹²⁹ *n* 85' 318-527 46 59 76 509
 16³ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458; -*πων* 376) O⁻³⁷⁶-707 500 *b d*⁻¹²⁵ *n* 392-527 128'-628 18 76
 16¹⁵ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458; -*πεν* 552 619) F^b M O⁻⁵⁸-381'-707 126-500-552 118'-537 *d n* 619 527 18 46 59 76
 19⁸ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458; -*πων* 376; -*πεν* 15-58 551 75 128) F^b 15-58'-376-381'-707 500-551 118'-537 107'-125 53'-246 *n* 619 527 128 18 59 76 509
 20¹⁹ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (-*πεν* 707 313 458 68 424) F^b 376-381'-707* 126-313-500 *b* 44'-125 *n* 527 68-128 76 424
 24¹⁴ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (-*πων* 376) F^b O⁻⁵⁸-15-707 126 44 246 75 527 59 76; *ειπεν* A F M oI⁻²⁹ Cⁿ-126 422 *d*⁻⁴⁴ 127 *t* 318 68' 18 46 424 509 646 Lat^ccod 102 Arab Bo Syh; *ειπ*^π 422 458
 32⁸ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (*ειπ*^π 458) 376-381'-767 44-125 246 *n* 343' 527 126 426
 36⁵ *εἶπαν*] *ειπον* (-*πων* 376; -*πεν* B 458) B F^b 72-376-381' 16*-414' 118'-537 44'-125 53'-246 *n* 527 318 126 426

It is clear from the above list that the translator used the Hellenistic form *εἶπαν* throughout. It is, however, the classical first singular which could easily be confused with the third plural, since both would be *εἶπον*. Thus one would expect the Hellenistic *εἶπα* to obtain throughout as well. The form is attested only four times. In three cases *εἶπα* is obviously original. These are

- 4²³ *εἶπα*] *ειπον n*
 32²⁴ *εἶπα*] *ειπον* (-*παν* 319) O⁻⁵⁸ 44-125 *f*⁻¹²⁹ 127 619 18 319 426; *ειπεν n*⁻¹²⁷ 71* 799
 32³⁴ *εἶπα*] *ειπον* 15-72-767 57-78 *n* 527 18 319*

The *n* group as always supports the classical second aorist form; besides that support the support is minimal. Much more problematic is 317 where the classical form is the majority reading. The evidence is as follows:

- εἶπα* A *b* 392] *ειπεν* B 15'-58-618-707-708 126-422 107'-125 56'-129 318 *z* 55 509 799; *ειπ*^π 458; *ειπον* *rell* = Ra

Though the third person reading might be considered possible, the first person singular is certainly original. In view of the usage elsewhere for this verb in Exod, it is clear that one should adopt *εἶπα* rather than *ειπον* here as well. It might be noted that the form *εἶπον* is reserved for the aorist imperative. Consequently, in Exod there is no possible confusion among this inflection, the first singular and the third plural.

Another root which bears investigation for Classical versus Hellenistic inflection

is the aorist stem $\epsilon\lambda\theta$ -. The evidence for it along with that for its compounds is as follows.

- 11 $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν A B O^{64txt*} 426 708 f 628 s x y z 55 59 76' 130 509 646' = Ra
 1422 $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν 58' 19'
 1423 $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν 106-107
 1520 $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν B 15'-58' b f -56* 527 z 130 = Ra
 1523 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$ omnes
 1527 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν B 82 53'-56^c-129 392 z 130 = Ra
 161 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν B 58'-82 129 392 120-128'-628 130 = Ra
 1622 $\epsilon\iota\sigma\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν B 58-82 f 392 z 130 = Ra
 1627 $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν B 58'-82 f 120-128'-628 130 = Ra
 1635 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$ omnes
 191 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν B M^{ms} 82 f 392 z -68' 799 = Ra
 192 $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν B 82 = Ra
 3226 $\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\nu$] -θοσαν ($\sigma\upsilon\nu\alpha\nu\theta$. 739) A F M' o I C'' d f -129 s t 71' y z -126 18 59 319 509 646'

Cf also the following:

- 133 $\epsilon\acute{\epsilon}\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$] -θατε A B F 29-58-82-426 129 127 30'-343' y -527 55* 59 130 319 509 799 = Ra
 1416 $\epsilon\iota\sigma\epsilon\lambda\theta\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega\sigma\alpha\nu$ F^b] -θατωσαν A B F 82'-426 75 30 55* 319 509 = Ra
 169 $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\theta\epsilon\tau\epsilon$ F^b] -θατε A B F 29'-58'-82 129 127 30' 121-392 55* 59 76' 509 799 = Ra

In all of these cases Ra simply followed B, but this is not justified. B is, as are all mss, an eclectic text. The Hellenization of second aorist stems was a gradual process, and since Exod was a third century B.C. product, the process would by no means be complete. Furthermore the work is a literary work, and classical forms would be replaced by Hellenistic ones at a much slower rate than in commercial papyri. The evidence is clear. Some Classical forms are unquestioned in Exod; cf e.g. 1523 1635 where no ms has a Hellenistic form. The reverse is never true, and it is reasonable to assume that the translator used the Classical form for this root throughout.

The Hellenistic form is also rejected for the root

- 149 $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$] $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu$ B 58-82 x 120-128'-628 = Ra

The only other instance of a variant $\epsilon\upsilon\rho\omicron\sigma\alpha\nu$ occurs at 1627 where it is supported by the three mss 118'-537. Obviously the translator used the Classical forms. This consistency is probably to be expected. A translator would hardly use variant forms in his own literary idiolect. When such variations do occur in the tradition, these are far more likely to be the result of scribes occasionally introducing their own usage in the course of their work, probably quite unconsciously. The result is that, rarely if ever, does one find a ms consistent in its usage.

On the other hand, the translator did not use the Attic augmented form for secondary tenses of this verb.

- 1522 $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu$] $\eta\nu\rho$. (cvar) A B M 29-58-82-376 14 610 129 75 30 y 55 59 319 509 = Ra
 1627 $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$] $\eta\nu\rho\omicron\nu$ M
 3313 349 $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\eta\kappa\alpha$ omnes
 3316 $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\eta\kappa\alpha$] $\eta\nu\rho$. 130
 3317 $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\eta\kappa\alpha\varsigma$ omnes

That $\epsilon\tilde{\upsilon}\rho\iota\sigma\kappa\omicron\nu$ in 1522 (the only possibly problematic case) rather than the Attic augmented form is original in spite of the latter's strong support seems clear, when the other secondary tense inflections are compared for Exod. This is also fully consistent with usage in the Ptolemaic papyri; cf Mayser I 2.101—103; Crönert 205.

On the other hand, for the verb *εὔχομαι* the situation is the reverse, since the augmented form is there original. Only the following variation occurs.

830 1018 *ἠὔξατο*] *εὐξ.* 426 127

For compounds with *εὐ-* only *εὐλόγέω* obtains, and that only twice.

2011 *εὐλόγησεν*] *ηὐλ.* A F M 29' 126-422 107'-125 *f*⁻²⁴⁶ 458 130-321-343'-730 *y*⁻¹²¹ 18
46 55 59 76' 509

3923 *εὐλόγησεν*] *ηὐλ.* A F M' 29 C'-761 *f*⁻¹²⁹ s 527 *y*⁻³¹⁸ 628 18 46 55 59 319 509 646'

As for Gen (cf THGG 187f) the unaugmented forms are to be preferred; cf Mayser I 2.111f.

Sigmatic endings for secondary tenses were apparently favored by the scribes who copied B, and they should not be taken overly seriously. Many of these were listed in the preceding paragraphs. Such an instance occurs at 1624 as well. Note *κατέλιπον*] *-ποσαν* B 58-82 *f*⁽⁻⁵³⁾ 318 120-128'-628 130 = Ra. It is most unlikely that the translator would have used the Classical form *κατέλιπον* at v.20 (where no witnesses in the tradition have the *-ποσαν* ending), and four verses later used the Hellenistic form. This is also true at 1635 *ἔφαγον* 2°] *-γοσαν* B 58^{ms}-82 56'-129 120-128-628 = Ra. Were the text of B+ original, it would mean that the translator within the confines of one verse had used both the Classical and the Hellenistic form of the third plural, a most unlikely situation. The verb also occurs at 2411 as *ἔφαγον* without variant. The B text is obviously secondary. So too at 171 *παρενέβαλον* is to be preferred to the variant text *παρενεβαλοσαν* (*-ρεμβ.* 128) supported by B 58^{ms}-82 56-129 120-128-628 = Ra; cf 1527 where *παρενέβαλον* is Exod, with no *-λοσαν* variant obtaining in the tradition.

The use of Classical rather than sigmatic inflections is also true for the imperfect forms.

338 *κατενόουν*] *κατενοουσαν* B 15'-58' b 129 55 426(vid) = Ra

Sigmatic endings for the imperfect third plural can be found occasionally as early as the third century B.C. (cf Mayser I 2.83), but they are rare. They became much more frequent in the second century and were apparently preferred to the regular *-ον* ending. For the use of the *-οσαν* ending in the LXX in general cf Thack 214. For the Pentateuch only *ἐπηξονούσαν* in Num 118 is attested.

This same choice obtains for three instances all in 1826.

ἐκρινον 1°] *εκρινοσαν* B 82 56'-129 z^{-68'} = Ra; *-ναν* 19' 107'-125 318' 799

ἀνέφερον] *-ροσαν* B 56'-129 z^{-68'} = Ra

ἐκρινον 2°] *εκρινοσαν* B 56'-129; *-ναν* 77 799

In all these cases as well as at 338 the ms support for the *-οσαν* ending is sparse and the Classical form is almost certainly original.

N. Simplex versus compound forms.

215 *κατόκησεν*] *ωκησεν* (*ωκισ.* 68) B 15 53'-56* n 392 68'-120' 55 130 = Ra

The simplex form occurs only once in Exod, at 1635 in the phrase *γῆν οἰκουμένην* for the Hebrew *אֶרֶץ נוֹשֶׁבֶת*, whereas the compound occurs four times (also at 1240

1514 15). The simplex variant is probably the result of partial haplography since it is preceded by *καί*. Though there is very little difference between the two verbs lexically, preference for the compound as original text is encouraged by the small support for the simplex variant, by the support of Phil for the compound, and the general tendency in Hellenistic Greek towards compound words.

312 ἀποστέλλω] -στέλω d 30-344* 121 59 Sa; *εξαπ.* O'-426 C''-126 413 53'-56 458 392 z 76' 130 = Ra; *εξαποστέλω* B 15'-426 413 n-458 799 Arm

ℳ has *אנכי שלחתיך* for which Exod has *ἐγώ σε ἀποστέλλω*. From the context it is clear that not the future but the present tense is original. The only question that needs discussion is whether the *ἀπο-* or the *ἐξαπο-* compound is original.

The Hebrew is vocalized as a Qal form. The Qal of *שלח* occurs 27 times in Exodus of which three are part of the idiom *שלח וירא*, leaving 24 times with the notion of "send." Four of these (44 twice 413 97) are not rendered by a compound of the root *στέλλω*. For two of these Exod used *συναποστέλλω*.

332 *συναποστέλω*] *αποστ.* 126

3312 *συναποστέλεις*] *αποστ.* 314

A few mss have *συ αποστ.*, clearly a scribal misinterpretation of *συναποστελεις*.

Of the remaining 18 instances three are rendered by the *εξαποστ.* compound. These are 320 omnes; 914 with *αποστ.* variant in 376-707 19' 730 392 18 Oxf 4(vid); 245 with *απεστ.* variant in 25 509. The Exod text is obviously secured.

Of the remainder the *απο-* compound is clearly original. No *εξαπο-* variants obtain at 25 314 15 428 522 927 2320 28. For the rest *εξαπο-* variants obtain as follows: 310 ms 761, 313 509, 716 55, 915 30'-343-344^{ms} x 130 799.

On the other hand, the verb *שלח* vocalized as a Piel stem occurs 46 times in Exodus. Only twice (1233 224) does Exod not render the word by a compound of the root *στέλλω*. Only three times (1010 157 2327) is the *αποστ.* compound used. In all the other cases (41 times) some form of *ἐξαποστέλλω* is used. In the following list are given only instances where an *απο-* variant has at least more than disparate support. I list only support for the *ἀποστέλλω* stem.

52 *ἐξαποστέλλω*] *αποστ.* 120'-128; *αποστέλω* 106 630

828 *ἐξαποστελῶ*] *αποστ.* 82'-135 s 646; *αποστέλλω* B 15-426 f = Ra

97 *ἐξαπέστειλεν*] *απεστ.* 16-77'-78 53 458 Oxf 4(vid)

935 *ἐξαπέστειλεν*] *απεστ.* f-246 318 509

107 *ἐξαπόστειλον*] *αποστ.* 64* C''

111 *ἐξαποστέλλη*] *αποστ.* A M 135 57^{ms} 56* 85^{ms} x 18

In none of these is the text seriously in question. It is obvious that Exod usually distinguished between the Qal and the Piel stems of *שלח* by rendering the former by *ἀποστέλλω* and the latter by *ἐξαποστέλλω*. One is then fully justified in choosing *ἀποστέλλω* as original text at 312.

523 *εἰσπεπόρευμαι*] *πεπορ.* A B 15' z = Ra

The context is *καὶ ἀφ' οὗ εἰσπεπόρευμαι πρὸς Φαραώ* for the Hebrew *ומאז באתי אל פרעה*. Either the simplex or the compound makes good sense and only usage can determine which is the original reading. The root *בוא* occurs 76 times in Exodus and in

order of frequency the following Greek words are used to render it: *εἰσέρχομαι* 29 times, *ἔρχομαι* (15), *παραγίνομαι* (12), *εἰσπορεύομαι* (10), *ἦκω* (3), twice each as *εἴσεμι*, *φέρω* and the phrase *δυσμῶν ἡλίου* (for *בא השמש*), and once as *εἰμί*.

On the other hand, *πορεύομαι* occurs 51 times and always renders the verb *הלך*. The conclusion is inescapable: in spite of the support by A B, the simplex is not the original text at 523, but *εἰσπεπόρευμαι* is.

93 *ἔσται*] *επεσται* B 72-82* x 527 120'-128' 130 646 = Ra

The verb is modified by *ἐν* phrases representing the text of *מ* literally. The general sense of *מ* is that the hand of Yahweh will be on your cattle, etc. The compound does reproduce the idea of "be upon." The trouble, however, lies in the Hebrew *ἐν* phrases. Normally *ἔπειμι* is modified either by the simple dative or by *ἐπί* phrases. Nor is *ἔπειμι* used elsewhere throughout LXX as a rendering for *היה* and it occurs in Exod elsewhere only at 822 where it constitutes an excellent interpretation of *עמד* and is properly modified by *ἐπ' αὐτῆς*.

What seems to have happened is that Exod rendered *היה ב'* literalistically by *ἔσται ἐν*, and the B reading seems to be a partial smoothing out of the text. The result was, however, still not idiomatic Greek.

185 *ἦλθεν*] *εξηλθεν* B 82 f 68'-120' = Ra

מ has *ויבא*, and Ra cannot be correct here. The verb *ἐξέρχομαι* occurs 37 times in Exod; of these 36 are renderings of the root *יצא* and one for *עלה*. On the other hand, the simplex verb obtains 21 times, 16 of which render *בוא*, three are for *הלך* and one for the Niphal of *נצב*; at 176 there is no *מ* equivalent. The simplex is obviously original here.

The variant text easily arose in the light of the context. The reference is to Jethro (Yothor), described as the priest of Madian who has heard about all the wonderful things God had done to Israel, and so he took his daughter and two grandsons and journeyed to join Moses, his son-in-law. Obviously he left Madian. But this passage simply states that he came *πρὸς Μωυσῆν*, and the verb must be *ἦλθεν*, not *εξηλθεν*.

263 *συνεχόμεναι* 1°] *εχομεναι* B(mg) oI-82' C'(-52' 313') 19' 610 129 x 68'-120' 55 424 = Ra; *εχομενα* 767

The root *חבר* occurs in the Qal only four times in Exodus, always in the sense of "joining" one thing to another, and is always rendered by the verb *συνέχω* in Exod (263 twice 287 3611). The verb also occurs in the Piel and is rendered by *συνάψεις* the three times it is translated (2669 11; it is not translated in 3610 twice 13 16 18), and for the Pual at 394 by *συμπλεγμένον* (3611). It should be noted that it is always rendered by a *συν-* compound, as one might expect semantically. Nor is the support for the variant simplex reading impressive, seeing that the B reading is not original to B but part of a marginal restoration, with the strongest group support coming from the Catena text group.

3211 *κατέναντι*] *εναντι* B 15'-29 d 56'-664 t 392 z-126 46 55 426 = Ra; *εναντιον* 129 126 509 799

The context is *καὶ ἐδέηθη Μωσῆς κατέναντι κυρίου* for *וַיִּחַל מֹשֶׁה אֶת פְּנֵי יְהוָה*. One might well have simply expected the genitive *του προσώπου* which obtains a number of times in LXX, though usually in literalistic translations. Nowhere else does *κατέναντι* obtain, although it makes perfectly good sense. On the other hand, *ἐναντι* does occur (Deut 9^{18 25} Sir 39⁵) as do *ἐναντίον* (Parap II 624) and *ἐνώπιον* (Reg III 8^{59 93}). It would be much easier to understand the simplification of *εναντι* from an original *κατέναντι* than the reverse, and it seemed judicious to choose *κατέναντι* as Exod.

3215 γεγραμμένοι 1°] καταγεγρα. B 15 392 68'-120' = Ra

ᾠ has *כתבים* both here and at the end of the verse. In both cases the participle refers to the tablets being written on both sides. In the second instance 68'-120' also have *καταγεγρα*. Ra simply followed B in having the compound in the first instance and the simplex in the second.

That either form would be possible is clear. Since the compound specifically means "inscribed," it might seem fitting in view of Exod adding *λίθιναι* to describe the *πλάκες*. On the other hand, the simplex more exactly renders the neutral notion underlying the Hebrew word. In any event, the translator would hardly have varied the rendering within the same verse, and since the support is extremely weak, it is the safer course to accept the simplex in both places.

3424 ἐμπλατύνω] πλατυνω B 15' 16-73 129 730 126-128'-407-628 55 = Ra

The compound and the simplex both mean "to widen," and either would fit. The same context obtains at 23¹⁸, i. e. "for when I shall cast out nations before thee and *ἐμπλατύνω* thy borders," (except for the lack of *τά* before *ἔθνη*). There the verb in question appears in the simplex form only in mss 126 56^c-129-246, i. e. the compound must be original. Since the simplex is supported by a small group of scattered mss at 3424, it is prudent to choose *ἐμπλατύνω* as critical text here as well. Incidentally, it might be noted that in the sense of "widening the borders" *ἐμπλατύνω* also occurs in Deut 12²⁰ and 19⁸ but *πλατύνω* with *τὰ ὅρια* only at Mac I 14⁶. The variant text is easily created as an auditory error. The word occurs after *καί*, pronounced /ke/, and the deletion (or addition) of /em/ before *πλατυνω* is easily made.

385 ἄνωθεν] επανωθεν B M' oII-29 f x 318' 68'-120' 18 55 59 799 = Ra; επανω 118'-537 426

It is difficult to decide whether *ἄνωθεν* or *επανωθεν* is the original form with the other as the variant. *ᾠ* is no guide here since it has no equivalent text. The phrase *ἄνωθεν τῆς κιβωτοῦ* which modifies *ἰλαστήριον*, must be judged solely on its own merits. The adverb is followed by the genitive, which is relatively rare according to LS, though it does occur in Exod at 25²¹ 36²⁸. The variant compound *επανωθεν*, probably because of the *επ-* element, commonly governs a genitive as its usage in LXX shows; in fact, it occurs in LXX generally far more often with the genitive than absolutely. It seems far easier then to understand *επανωθεν* as a simplifying variant from

the rarer *ἄνωθεν* than the reverse, and *ἄνωθεν* accordingly has been adopted as the critical text.

3921 *καλύμματα*] *καταλυμ(μ)ατα* 618 54-313' 610 343 527 126; *κατακαλ.* (c var) A F oI⁻⁶¹⁸⁻²⁹ C'-25-52'-422 118'-537 106-125' 56-129 458 s⁻³⁴³ t 121 128'-628^c 46 59 319 509 799

It is almost impossible to choose between the simplex and the compound here. It is true that the simplex nowhere else in Exod renders *מכסה*, whereas the compound does (2614 3511 4019), but this is not overly significant; earlier in the verse *מכסה* also occurs and for it Exod has *διφθέρας* "hides," whereas later in the verse *ἐπικαλύμματα* is used for *מס*. Since B is the oldest text and its reading has quite substantial support, it seemed prudent not to disagree with the text chosen by Ra.

O. The text tradition tends to expand the text as it left the hands of the translator.

One problem obtains in connection with the phrase "from (the land of) Egypt." Three instances might seem somewhat problematic. These are:

- 133 *ἐξ* 1°] *ἐκ γης* B 135 75-127 s 619 392 130 799 Latcod 104 Arab Co Syh = Ra; *ἐκ της γης* 458
 321 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐξ* B F M O''-708 C'' d 129 n s t 527 121' 18 46 55 59 319 426 509 646 Latcod 100 Arm Syh = Ra
 3223 *ἐκ γης* Act 740] *ἐξ* B F M' O''-58 b d f n 30'-85mg-130mg-321'mg t-84 x y-318 18 46 55 59 319 426 509 799 Latcod 100 Arm Syh = Ra

The decision concerning the critical text can only be made intelligently by examining how the translator operated. The evidence for *ἐξ* versus *ἐκ γης* before *Αἰγύπτου* is given in the list below. Only when the variant = *ℳ* is that fact noted. In all other cases the lemma = *ℳ*.

- 310 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 707 56* = *ℳ*
 311 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 707 59; *ἐξ* 426 75 = *ℳ*
 312 *ἐξ*] *ἐκ γης* 53' 527 76' Latcod 100 Aeth Bo^B Sa³
 613 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* cI-52'-54-313' 84; *ἐξ* 25 n⁽⁻⁶²⁸⁾
 626 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐξ* A 15-58'-82'-376 25 b 44-610 f n 85-127-321^{txt}-343' x 121 z 76' Ach Arab Bo^B Sa; *ἐκ της* 321^{mg}
 627 *ἐξ*] *ἐκ γης* B 126 30' x 318' 59 646 Aeth = *ℳ*^{ms}; *ἐκ της* 321^{mg}
 74 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 82
 1110 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 72 318; *ἐξ* 381' 75: *מֵאֶרֶץ* *ℳ*
 1217 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* M 15 Syh
 1239 *ἐξ* omnes
 1241 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 509; *ἐξ* 72 Sa
 1242 *ἐκ γης* omnes
 1251 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 551; *ἐξ* 610 Arab
 138 *ἐξ*] *ἐκ γης* (sub ✕ Syh) 15-426 n 30'-85'^{txt}-343' 527 130 Latcod 104 Aeth^P Arab Bo Syh
 139 *ἐξ*] *ἐκ γης* 53' Arab Bo
 1314 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐξ* 376'-381' 55 Syh = *ℳ*
 1316 *ἐξ*] *ἐκ γης* 53 Arab Arm^{te} Co
 1318 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 46 55; *ἐξ* A 707 n Sa
 1411 *ἐξ* F^b] *ἐκ γης* F 135 422 44 s 318' 130 509 799 Bo
 161 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 618
 166 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 707
 1632 *ἐκ γης*] *ἐκ της* 458

- 173 ἐξ] εκ γης 392* Aeth^R Arab Bo^A
 181 ἐξ] e terra ^{Lat}cod 104 Aeth^P
 191 ἐκ γῆς] εξ x Sa²
 202 ἐκ γῆς] εκ της 458; εξ 799
 2315 ἐξ] εκ γης 767 Arm Bo
 2946 ἐκ γῆς] εξ 53'-56
 324 ἐκ γῆς] εκ της 799; εξ 767 C" n 85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343'-346^{txt} ^{Lat}cod 104
 327 ἐκ γῆς] εκ της 739 Ach; εξ 707 106 426
 329 ἐκ γῆς] de ^{Lat}cod 104 Arm^{te}
 3211 ἐκ γῆς] εξ 129 ^{Lat}cod 104 Arab
 331 ἐκ γῆς] εξ 707
 3418 ἐξ] εκ γης (της 799) 707-767 b 56' 527 318' 799 ^{Lat}cod 103 Aeth Bo Sa^{1te}
 4015 ἐξ] εκ γης (της 707) 707 C" s 424 646 Aeth^{CR} Arm Bo: non hab $\mathfrak{M}$

It will be noted that Exod is extraordinarily careful to distinguish מן from מארץ in the phrase "from (the land of) Egypt." In only three instances, 310 11 1314, does Exod disagree with $\mathfrak{M}$ in this regard, and one may with some confidence predicate a different parent text for these three. In view of the care that Exod exercised one can also be clear on the critical text in the three instances introducing this note.

- 112 ἰσχυον F 426 s-321^{mg} 121' 59 509 Aeth Bo Syh] > 135; + σφοδρα A*(vid) 29 16 b 44 53' n 619 Ach Arm; + σφοδρα σφοδρα rell = Ra

The context reads καθότι δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐταπείνουν τοσούτῳ πλείους ἐγίνοντο καὶ ἰσχυον, an idiomatic rendering of כִּנְיָהּ וְכִנְיָהּ יַעֲנֵהוּ אֲתוּ כֵן יִרְבֶּה וְכִנְיָהּ, which clearly interprets the metaphor of כִּנְיָהּ by the verbal inflection ἰσχυον. The majority text can hardly be original LXX; it has no basis in the parent text nor does it correctly interpret it. The source for the doublet intensifier is v. 7 καὶ κατίσχυον σφόδρα σφόδρα where it literally (and quite correctly) renders וַיַּעֲצֵמוּ בַּמֶּאֱדָר מֵאֲדָר. That the translator did operate in this way is further substantiated by v. 20 where וַיַּעֲצֵמוּ מֵאֲדָר is rendered by καὶ ἰσχυεν σφόδρα.

- 216 τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῶν 1° Fb O-58-29-707^{txt}-708 cI 118'-537 106 53' 628 121 799 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ach Aeth Arm Sa³ Syh] pr ραγουήλ 46^c 509; pr ιοθορ (cvar) A F d-106 n-628 t-46^c 318' 76' Bo; + ιοθορ (cvar) rell = Ra
 — αὐτῶν 2°] + ιοθορ (cvar) A^c B 15'-64^{mg} 19' 56'-129 392-527 z 55 76' 130 799 Ach Sa = Ra

Compare also

- 218 'Ραγουήλ] ιοθορ A 82 73-77^{mg}-413^{mg}-550-552^{mg} 118'-537 d-106 85'^{mg}-344^{mg} t-46^c 84 x 392 ^{Lat}cod 100 Ach Sa; ιοθορ 57^{mg} 19' 84 527 319; ιωθορ 76; ιορθορ 552^{txt}

Ra adopted ιοθορ twice in v. 16 and 'Ραγουήλ in v. 18. $\mathfrak{M}$ only has רַעוּאֵל in v. 18. In view of the fact that the translator tends to smooth out the text and, above all, to remove even slight inconsistencies, it is difficult to explain such a volte face for Exod as Ra based on the B text presupposes. It would mean that the translator voluntarily twice introduced an unnecessary inconsistency into his text without the impulse of a Hebrew parent text.

In this story of Moses' arrival in Midian the father of his future wife is called 'Ραγουήλ. Only later (31 418 and throughout ch. 18) is he called Ιοθόρ. The tradition has introduced the name ex par without noting that when the daughters come home from the well it is to their father 'Ραγουήλ. In further support of this textual recon-

struction is the fact that the tradition was troubled by *Παγουήλ* and its “correction” in the tradition to *ιοθορ* is well attested.

Incidentally, the secondary character of the proper name in v. 16 is rendered likely in the first instance by the uncertainty of the placement of the name, a common characteristic of glosses in the tradition.

311 (τῆς εἰμι] pr (※ Syh) *εγω* 58-376 128' Syh; *ego* ^{LatAug} *Loc in hept* II 9 Aeth Bo = $\mathfrak{M}$; + (※ Arm^{ms}) *εγω* A^c B F^b 15'-72-135*-426-*oI* 126-550' *b n*-628 527 55 130 509 ^{Latcod} 100 Arm Sa

It is clear from the hex signs in Arm and Syh that *εγω* is a hex plus. The Hebrew has *אני אנוכי*. The usual rendering of *אני/אנוכי* as subject of a nominal sentence is indeed *ἐγώ εἰμι*, as in 3₆ 14 4₁₀ 7₅ 8₂₂ 14₄ 18 20₂ and 29₄₆. The collocation also obtains but with intervening text at 6₁₂ 30 15₂₆. On the other hand, *εἰμι* without *εγω* does occur elsewhere in Exod (22₂ 4₁₀-1° and 22₂₇).

318 τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν A B 15'-72 130*(cprm)] *αυτω* 72; pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ rel = $\mathfrak{M}$
53 τῷ θεῷ A B 15 19' f-246 z Sa] pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ rel = $\mathfrak{M}$

In both cases Exod has the shorter text and it has been amplified to agree with the Hebrew, probably by Origen. The phrase occurs in the context of “worship (the LORD) God.” Exod also uses the phrase without a *κυριω* in the following. In each case the text of $\mathfrak{M}$ follows.

312 τῷ θεῷ omnes (את האלהים)
58 τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν] pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ *b* 527 55 Aeth Arab Bo (ליהוה)
517 τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν] pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ *b* Aeth^C (ליהוה)
825 τῷ θεῷ (ὕμῶν)] pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ A M *oI* C''-25 500 75' s-30 γ-392 z 18 76' 130 646' Arab Arm Bo; τῷ $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ (+ και 30) *θεω* 30 59 (לאֱלֹהִים)
1011 τῷ θεῷ] pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ 29-64^{ms} 126 246 *n s* 392-527 130 799 Syh; τῷ $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ A 15-135-376' 121 55 59 509 Pal; $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ 118'-537 (את יהוה)

Over against this Exod used *κυριω* in the same context nine times. Again the text of $\mathfrak{M}$ is added at the end in parentheses.

826 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν] om *κυριω* 15-376 422*(cprm)-500 527 Aeth (ליהוה אלהינו).
827 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν] om *κυριω* B 56* (ליהוה אלהינו)
828 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ ὕμῶν] om *κυριω* B 619 (ליהוה אלהים)
107 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ αὐτῶν] om *κυριω* B 82 f-246 = Ra (את יהוה אלהים)
108 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ ὕμῶν] om *κυριω* B 82 56-129 Sa = Ra (את יהוה אלהים)
1024 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ (ὕμῶν) omnes (את יהוה)
1026 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν 1°] om *κυριω* 610 (את יהוה אלהינו)
1026 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν 2°] om *κυριω* 15 619 (את יהוה)
1231 *κυριω* τῷ θεῷ ὕμῶν] om *κυριω* Sa (את יהוה)

In two cases Ra adopted the shorter text on the basis of B (10₇₈), but in two other cases he did not do so (82₂₈). It would seem that the text of B is not overly good evidence. Of the sixteen instances in total B has *κυριω* only five times, i.e. over against the nine instances where Exod had the longer text. It seems wiser to discount the evidence of B in these cases particularly in view of the consistently weak support for the shorter text in each instance.

Another instance of the shorter text obtains at 19₂₂, but there the longer text is the majority tradition.

τῷ θεῷ A 58 77 *b* 53' 127* 318' 628 55 799 Aeth^P Arab Arm] *ad dominum* Spec 47 = $\mathfrak{M}$;
pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ rel = Ra

The occurrence of *κύριος ὁ θεός* without a following genitive is rare in Exod and when it occurs there seems to be some exegetical reason for it. Only the following obtain:

138 *κύριος ὁ θεός*, but with *μοι* (*μου* is a substantially supported reading) following immediately

346 *κύριος ὁ θεός οἰκτιρῶν καὶ ἐλεήμων . . .*

3414 *ὁ γὰρ κύριος ὁ θεός ζηλωτὸν ὄνομα θεός ζηλωτής ἐστίν*

Problematic is 139 *κύριος*] + *ο θεος* B 82 246 85' 318 130 799 = Ra; + *ο θεος σου* 58 106-107' 56-129 *n t* 120-128'-628 Sa.

The shorter text = *ℳ*, and the support for a longer text is hardly strong enough to warrant adoption of it as critical text. It is simply a gloss based on the oft-recurring phrase "Yahweh (thy) God;" cf e.g. v. 11.

At 19²² the argument for the shorter text also takes into account the fact that the substitution of *ὁ θεός* for *יהוה* in *ℳ* is frequently to be found in Exod even when no obvious reason for it is to be found. It is sufficiently frequent to question the explanation that a different parent text obtained. In fact, it is interesting to study the occurrences of *κύριος* and *ὁ θεός* in Exod. The name *κύριος* obtains 389 times in Exod, of which 19 refer to a human master and must be discounted. Of the 370 that apply to God, 342 instances occur for *יהוה* in *ℳ*, and seven represent *אדני* (or *אדון*); in one case (34²³) *ℳ* has *יהוה האדון*. In 14 cases there is no equivalent in *ℳ*; in most of these *κύριος* has been added as subject of a verb. Of the remaining six, two have *יהוה אלהים*, i. e. *אלהים* has no equivalent in Exod, and only four cases obtain of *κύριος*, where *ℳ* has *אלהים*. These are 34 13¹⁹ 18¹ 20¹.

On the other hand, *θεός* occurs 182 times in Exod, of which 119 represent *אלהים* in *ℳ*, and 43, *יהוה*. In 5 cases there is no equivalent whatsoever in *ℳ*. The remaining 15 have the following equations in *ℳ*: *יהוה אלהים* nine, *אל* four, and *אל שדי* two.

The surprising fact that emerges from the above statistics is the frequency of *θεός* occurring when *ℳ* has *יהוה*, approximately one-fifth; in fact, if one subtracts the five instances without equivalents in *ℳ*, it accounts for 43 out of 177. Of these 43 instances, 10 obtain in ch. 19 and 5 in ch. 16; in other words, over a third occur in these two chapters alone.

It would seem overly daring to suggest that all of these were due to a different parent text, since the overall tendency of Hebrew scribes would have been in the direction towards *אלהים* rather than towards *יהוה* in view of the ineffability of the personal name. Furthermore the tendency towards increasing occurrences of *θεός* at the expense of *κύριος* is more marked in Exod than in the other books of the Pentateuch.

It should also be said that there is no obvious pattern to be found that betrays the translator's prejudice in the particular occurrences beyond the general trend noted above, unless it be part of the tendency of the Exodus translator to enhance divine transcendence and to avoid here and there the crasser instances of familiarity with God on the part of man.

510 *ἐργοδιώκται*] + *του* (bis scr 646) *λαου* F M O'-29 C" *d n*-628 *s t γ*-392 *z* 18 55 59 76' 130 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = *ℳ*

The Hebrew does have נגיש העם, but the translator omitted the second word since it is rhetorically quite otiose to the account. The addition is then a hebraizing correction (possibly prehexaplaric).

623 τόν] + τε A B O⁻⁴²⁶-15' d⁻¹²⁵ f n t γ⁻¹²¹ z 130 = Ra

The word τόν modifies Ναδάβ, and ℳ has את נדב, and is thus neutral on the textual problem involved. Ms 835, apparently does not have τε. It should be noted that B* (as well as others) has αδαβ instead of Ναδάβ. This must mean that the parent text of B* could not have had τε, since the loss of the initial nu resulted from haplography, i.e. τόν must have immediately preceded it. With both B* and 835 as our oldest witnesses (both from the fourth century) testifying to the shorter text, it seems reasonable to assume its originality.

820 fin] + εν τη ερημω A B M 64^{ms}-82 19' f 321 γ⁻¹²¹ 120'-128' 18 130 799 Arab Bo = Ra

In spite of the impressive support for the prepositional phrase it has probably entered the tradition from 716, though cf also 51 828. It occurs in the recurring "send away my people that they may serve me" to which 716 adds ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ. But usually it occurs without the phrase (423 81 91 13 103), and the more commonly occurring shorter text is likely to be original text at 820 as well.

94 ἐγώ] + εν τω καιρω εκεινω A^c B 318' z 130 799 = Ra; + εν τη ημερα εκεινη (τη αυριον 527) 19' 527

Exod renders the verse in first person rather than in third person with יהוה as subject as ℳ does; i.e. for יהוה והפלה Exod has παραδοξάσω ἐγώ. At 822 exactly the same verb form occurred and was modified by ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ. There, however, it was based on a Hebrew parent text. Here it seems to be a gloss based on the passage in 822 and not original at all in spite of support by B+. The majority text is to be preferred here.

97 τῶν κτηνῶν] pr παντων B 82 106-107' 56'-129 458' t⁽⁻⁴⁶⁾ 318 z 55 Sa Syh = Ra

This Byzantine reading would not be taken seriously by anyone if B did not support it, and it does not deserve serious consideration. It is a gloss taken over from v. 4, where it might be observed that the Byzantine text read απο παντων των κτηνων των υιων ιηλ as well. The popular and shorter text is clearly original.

105 περισσόν] + της γης B 82 f 318' 120-128' 130 799 = Ra

The exegetical gloss interprets περισσόν as referring to the land (i.e. metonymic for the fruits of the land). In my opinion it is secondary, as the uncertainty of the proper placement of the gloss indicates. Ms 646 has it after καταλειφθέν, whereas 85^{ms}-343-344^{ms} have the gloss before πᾶν τὸ περισσόν. The gloss is quite unnecessary in view of the fact that τὴν γῆν obtains at the end of the preceding clause, and it alone can serve as the referent for περισσόν. It is true that the translator often does make explicit what is implicit, but if the gloss were original, it would be difficult to explain its omission in the majority tradition.

1023 *αὐτοῦ* 1°] + *τρεις ημερας* B 82 f-246 527 120 130 799 Latcod 104 Arm Sa = Ra

This gloss has no basis in $\mathfrak{M}$ nor has it any claim to originality. It came into the tradition from its context; it is original both in the immediately preceding and succeeding clauses.

119 *πληθύνω*] pr *πληθυνων* B 58-82 f-246 392 120-128' 76' 130 799 = Ra

$\mathfrak{M}$ simply has *רבות* (after *למען*). But this should be seen along with the following two cases within the verse:

- *μου|τὰ σημεῖα* B 82' x 392 120-128' 76'] om *μου* 53'-56* 127 130 799 Arm^{te}; tr rell
- *τέρατα* B oII-15 610 127 x 527 128' 18 55 76' Arm Syh] + *μου* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

From this it appears that the B+ text reads *ἵνα πληθυνων πληθύνω μου τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα* whereas the popular text has *ἵνα πληθυνω τα σημεια μου και τα τερατα μου*. The text of $\mathfrak{M}$ has *למען רבות מופתי*, i.e. it does not have *μου τὰ σημεῖα καί*, an expansion from 73. The expansion is also present in v.10 which reads *πάντα τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα ταῦτα* for $\mathfrak{M}$'s *את כל המפתים האלה*. There the text is shortened to = $\mathfrak{M}$ (i.e. *τὰ σημεῖα καί* is omitted) by A* O-58-15-64'-707 C''-57^mg b-19 246 n 30'-85-321^{ext}-344^{ext} 121' 68' 55 59 646 Latcod 102 Aeth Pal, probably due to *τά* 1° ∩ 2°. For the collocation "signs and wonders" cf THGD 98 (no. 50).

Usually the genitive pronoun follows the noun it modifies as in the Hebrew, but occasionally it precedes (for *μου* cf 10¹⁷ 28 13¹⁹ 15² 33²⁰ 22) or for *σου* (318 416 19 71 823). Since it is the unusual order, it is probably to be preferred, as is the lack of *μου* after *τέρατα* against $\mathfrak{M}$. In each of these cases the text of B representing the majority text has been followed.

In the case of the added *πληθυνων* in 119 the B text is of course wrong. It represents a dittograph and only the addition of nunation makes it a possible reading. It has no basis in $\mathfrak{M}$ which has *רבות* understood by Exod as a first singular verb. The fact that *רבות* is vocalized as an infinitive in $\mathfrak{M}$ is quite irrelevant to the problem of *πληθυνων*, since this entered the tradition later than Exod.

123 *πρόβατον* 2°] pr *εκαστος* A^c B 82 131^(c2) 56^c-129 x 392 120-128' 130 Sa³ = Ra

If this word were to be taken as original, it would mean that the translator felt the phrase *πρόβατον κατ' οἰκίαν* at the end of the verse to be overly abrupt. On the other hand, *εκαστος* preceding it looks suspiciously like a gloss based on the immediately preceding *ἕκαστος πρόβατον κατ' οἶκους πατριῶν*. The shorter text would stylistically highlight the contrast between the plural *οἶκους πατριῶν* and the singular *οἰκίαν*. Furthermore $\mathfrak{M}$ supports the shorter text and it is probably the original text here.

1214 *τὰς γενεάς*] pr *πασας* B 82 f-246 = Ra

The *πασας* has no basis in $\mathfrak{M}$, nor in the LXX tradition anywhere, i.e. nowhere in the LXX does the phrase *εις πασας τας γενεας* (*υμων*) occur. The phrase is probably N.T. in origin (Eph 321). This well-known doxology is the likely origin of the gloss in the B+ tradition.

1221 *γερονσίαν*] + (+ *των* 16-500 19 53' 619 527 799) *υιων* B 58-381'-426 C''-126 19 610 f 458-628 619 527 128 424 646' Arm Sa = Ra

The variant has no support in $\mathfrak{M}$. The word *γερονσία* occurs only at 316 18 429 1221 and 249. Only at 316 and 429 is it modified by *τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ*; in the former Sam has בני and it seems likely that Exod's parent text had it as well. At 429 $\mathfrak{M}$ also has the longer text. At 318 and 249 the word is also modified by *ישראל* and is = $\mathfrak{M}$. Only at 249 does the variant *γερονσίας*] + *των υιων n*⁻¹²⁷ occur. It seems likely that the B variant in 1221 is secondary, being merely an expansion of *Ἰσραήλ* to *υιων ἱηλ*, and not original Exod which seems throughout to have been careful not to confuse *υἱοὶ Ἰσραήλ* and *Ἰσραήλ*. Note also that in the two unquestioned instances of *τῶν υἱῶν* after *γερονσία*, 316 429, the *υἱῶν* is articulated and not as in the B variant simply *υιων*.

148 *Αἰγύπτου*] + *και* (+ *την καρδιαν* A Sa; + *παντων* 82) *των θεραποντων αυτου* A B M^{ms} 29-82 57'^{ms} 44' *f* 458 30'-85'^{ms}-344^{ms} *t* 71 *γ*⁻¹²¹ 120-128'-628 76' 509 Co = Ra

The variant text has no support in $\mathfrak{M}$ and is a gloss from v. 5 where $\mathfrak{M}$ has לבב פרעה ועבדיו probably rendered by *ἡ καρδιά Φαραὼ καὶ τῶν θεραπόντων αὐτοῦ*. Here, however, it does not fit into the context, since the text continues with “and *he* pursued after the Israelites,” which a number of mss have further “corrected” by changing the verb to the plural. For the variant phrase cf also 710 and 831.

1420 *Ἰσραήλ*] + *και εστη* (*εστι* 458) A^c B 82 19' *f*^{-56^{txt}} 458 392-527 120-128'-628 130 799 Sa = Ra

The reference is to the pillar of cloud. In v. 19 it is stated that the cloudy pillar moved from before them and stood behind them. V. 20 continues with “And it went in between the camp of the Egyptians and (between) the camp of Israel.” That it stood had already been stated in v. 19 which is the source of the variant text which incidentally has no support in $\mathfrak{M}$. The text then does go on to say that there was *σκότος καὶ γνόφος* and night came on, and they did not mix with each other the entire night. $\mathfrak{M}$ is not clear in part. It has *וַיֹּאֲרֶה אֶת הַלַּיְלָה* for which Exod has *καὶ διήλθεν ἡ νύξ*. Since $\mathfrak{M}$ seems to say that darkness lit up the night, Exod interprets this to mean that darkness, or rather night, intervened. Exod may well have had $\mathfrak{M}$ as parent text and tried to make sense out of it.

1626 *οὐκ*] *pr οτι* B M^{ms} 82 19' *f*^{Z-122* (628)} 130 799 Sa = Ra

$\mathfrak{M}$ does not support the variant text, but has an asyndeton clause. $\mathfrak{M}$ says: “but on the seventh day is a sabbath; not shall there be (any) in it.” The variant text represents an attempt to soften the starkness of the parent text by interpreting the fact that there is no manna on that day as the reason for its being the sabbath. It really should be the other way around; the sabbath is the reason for no manna obtaining. The scribal attempt to clarify actually results in a false interpretation.

1629 *ἐκπορεύεσθω* B 72-707 14* *b n* 527 799 Aeth Arm] *υμων εκπορευετω* 313* 107'-125 619; *υμων εμπορ.* 18; + *υμων* 14^c Latcod 102; *pr υμων* rell
1629 *ἐκ F^b*] *pr εκαστος* A F M oI-29 C" 44' *s t x γ*⁻⁵²⁷ 120-128'-628 18 46 55 59 76' 509 799 Arab Arm Bo^{AcB} = $\mathfrak{M}$

The context reads *μηδεις εκπορεύεσθω εκ του τόπου αυτου* and parallels *καθήσεσθε εκαστος εις τους οίκους υμων* which immediately precedes it. It might well be argued

that one would expect *εκαστος* in the second clause as well since Exod occasionally parallels such clauses (as 16¹⁶ 32²⁷); in fact, the *εκαστος* is probably introduced due to the influence of the earlier clause. On the other hand, the *μηδεις* vitiates the usefulness of a *εκαστος* in the clause and only the addition of *υμων* after *μηδεις* gives point to the *εκαστος*. The addition of *υμων* may also have been influenced by *οικους υμων* occurring immediately before it. In other words, the two variants belong together; either they are both original text or are both secondary. The latter seems the more likely.

173 *εγόγγυζεν*] + *εκει* B 15'-58-376 *b* 120-128-628 ^{Lat}cod 102 Arm^{ap} = Ra

There is no good reason for adopting the variant text except for the fact that B has it. *℣* does not have it and the word is exegetically otiose. The preceding clause states that the people thirsted *ἐκεῖ* for water, and this clause states that the people murmured against Moses. There is no need to repeat the fact that it was *there* that they murmured. The word crept in under the influence of its occurrence in the preceding clause.

1710 *παρετάξατο*] *pr* *εξελθων* B F^bvid 58-82' 19' 44' *f n t* 318' *z* 55 799 Co = Ra

Though the variant is well-supported in the tradition its originality is doubtful. The shorter text was known to Origen since O-⁵⁸ Arm Syh do not witness to it. Furthermore it easily entered the text from v. 9 where it is original. Nor does *℣* support it here, though it does in v. 9. The idiom "to go out and fight" was well-known and undoubtedly influenced the scribe as well. It would be much more difficult to explain the omission of an original *εξελθων*. Origen on his own testimony did not shorten texts but marked materials having no counterpart in the Hebrew with an obelus. It would, of course, be possible to postulate a prehexaplaric revision towards the Hebrew, but this is quite unnecessary if the shorter text be considered original.

184 *Ἐλιέζεϛ*] + *λεγων* B 58-82 19' *f* 392-527 *z* 76' Aeth^C Arm Sa = Ra

It might be argued that *λεγων* is original here to parallel v. 3, but the situation is somewhat different there. First of all, *℣* has *כִּי אָמַר* in v. 3 which is freely rendered by *λέγων*, whereas v. 4 has only *כִּי*. Furthermore in v. 3 *כִּי* is not rendered at all, whereas in v. 4 the postpositive *γάρ* obtains. This in turn makes an original *λεγων* unlikely. It is far more likely that the word came in under the influence of the Greek v. 3 and is therefore secondary.

1821 *fin* B F^b M 15-72-426-707^{ext}-oI 19' 127 120'-122* 18^{ext} 46 55 76' ^{Lat}cod 104 Aeth Arab Arm Sa Syh] + *και γραμματοεισαγωγεις* (cvar) *rell*

1825 *fin* F^b] + *και γραμματοεισαγωγεις* (cvar) A F 29-82-376-707^{ms} C" *b d f n*-127 *s t x y* 68'-128'-628 59 509 646' Bo

The popular variant which comes at the end of the list: captain of thousands, and of hundreds, and of fifties, and of tens has no basis in *℣*. It is an intrusion from Deut 115 where it stands in exactly the same context, but has a basis in *℣*.

2214 ἡ ἀποθάνῃ A* F 58 C 118'-537 527 59 76' 509 Latcod 103 Aeth Arab Bo Syh^{Lxt}] pr η αιχμαλωτων γενηται (> 707) 707-767 d n 30' t 55 Syh^{Lmgt}; + η αιχμαλωτων (θηριαλωτων aut -τος cI') γενηται F^a rell = Ra

The shorter text equals $\mathfrak{M}$ and is likely original. The longer variant texts are dependent on v. 10 where the longer text = $\mathfrak{M}$. Note also the uncertainty as to the placement of the gloss, with the Byzantine tradition secondarily placing it before ἡ ἀποθάνῃ, instead of after it as does the popular variant.

2220 ἐξολεθρευθήσεται] θανατω (-του 664) ολεθ. (cvar) B 58-82 f^{-56*} = Ra; ολεθρ. (aut ολοθρ.; cvar) 15-72 n^{-127c}

There are two problems here, the θανατω gloss and the simplex versus the compound verb. The first of these hardly need be problematic; it has no basis in $\mathfrak{M}$, and it is weakly supported in the tradition; it almost certainly came in under the influence of the preceding verse.

The matter of the verb is much more difficult. $\mathfrak{M}$ has יחרם, a verb occurring only here in Exodus. The simplex occurs without question at 12²³ where המשחית is rendered in Exod by τὸν ὀλεθρεύοντα; the simplex has unanimous support in the tradition. The compound verb occurs in five other places in Exod, at 8²⁴ for the Niphal of חתח with full support, and for the Niphal of כרת in 12^{15 19} 30³³ (ms 426 having the simplex), and 31¹⁴. Obviously, there is no pattern being followed by the translator, and the tradition alone can decide. Since the simplex is only weakly supported, it seemed judicious to adopt the compound.

2322 init F 29-oI^{-64mg} x γ⁻³⁹² 68' 59 Latcod 102 Aeth Arab Arm] pr (※64^{mg}) ταυτα τα ρηματα ερεις τοις υιοις ἡλ̄ oI 318; pr (cvar; ※ 57'-73-500' 56 130) εαν ακοη ακουσητε της φωνης μου και ποιησητε παντα οσα αν ειπω σοι και φυλαξητε την διαθηκην μου εσεσθε μοι λαος περιουσιος απο παντων των εθνων εμη γαρ εστιν πασα η γη υμεις δε εσεσθε μοι βασιλειον ιερατευμα και εθνος αγιον (sub ※ adhuc 85-344) ταυτα τα ρηματα ερεις τοις υιοις ἡλ̄ rell = Ra

In spite of the asterisks the popular doublet has no place in $\mathfrak{M}$; in fact, the asterisks must be interpreted as errors for obeli. This might then be understood as demonstrating the originality of this long plus. It is, however, nothing of the kind. The asterisks (qua obeli) simply mean that Origen's Greek parent manuscript(s) had it.

It is in point of fact a plus which at an early date (at least preOrigenian) came into the text, taken over bodily from 19^{ss}. Once it was taken over the influence of its doublet counterpart served to attract και ποιησης παντα οσα αν ειπω σοι within the borrowed verses. Its secondary character within the plus may be seen by the fact that the oldest mss attesting to the text still have the singular ποιησης of the original. In due course this was naturally levelled to the plural.

The secondary nature of this long plus is also clear from the fact that the original plural of 19^{ss} is retained in its new location. Verse 21 was quite correctly in the singular, and so is v. 22

Note how the doublet in turn influenced the tradition of v. 22 as well. The singular ακούσης is plural in B O⁻⁷⁶⁷-15' 131^c f⁻²⁴⁶ 458 76' 799 Bo^{Ac} = Ra, and ποιήσης also becomes plural in B 131^c. They are, of course, not to be taken seriously; throughout the remainder of the verse the second person references are all in the singular.

2514 *τῆς κιβωτοῦ* B F^a 128'-407-628 426 646 ^{Lat}codd 95 96 et Al: 91 94 Aeth^C Arab] > 68; *τῆς διαθήκης* A F M 29-58-82-707* -οΙ b x 527 122 46 55 59 76' 424 509 ^{Lat}cod 102 Aeth^C Bo Syh; + *τῆς διαθήκης* rell

The reading of A+ presupposes the popular reading; their parent text read *τῆς κιβωτοῦ τῆς διαθήκης*, and *τῆς διαθήκης* was created by parablepsis due to homoiarchon.

There is no basis for *τῆς διαθήκης* in $\mathfrak{M}$; in fact, the phrase *τῆς διαθήκης* modifying “ark” occurs only twice in Exod (31⁷ 39¹⁵), in both cases rendering עֲדֹת, elsewhere rendered by τοῦ μαρτυρίου. In fact, the phrase אֲרֹן הַבְּרִית “ark of the covenant” is rare in the Pentateuch, occurring only in Deut 10⁸ 31⁹ 25 26, though it is frequent in other parts of the O. T., particularly in Joshua. It seems far more likely that the phrase was introduced ex par from the non-Pentateuchal Greek O. T. in the course of the text tradition than that it was original. If the phrase were original, it would mean that B and z mss represented a hebraizing correction which does not seem overly likely. Ra was fully justified in following the shorter text here.

2533 *καρύσκους*] + (+ οἱ σφερωτήρες 106) *εν τω* (> A 106 75) *καλαμισκω τω ενι* A M 767 106-125' n t 18 46; + *εν τω* (> 15-376) *ενι καλαμισκω* (cvar) B O^{-767-15'} 131^c 19' f 318' 68'-120' 55 799 = Ra

The popular plus can hardly be original, but came in from v. 32 where it did make good sense. There too it followed *κρατήρες ἐκτετυπωμένοι καρύσκους*, but the point was being made that the lampstand had six branches and three bowls fashioned like almonds were to be found on each branch, in other words 18 *κρατήρες* total on the branches. V. 33 goes on to say that beyond all that the lampstand itself also had four such bowls, i. e. 22 *κρατήρες* in all. Adding the gloss makes a quite impossible text. The gloss is simply the result of a careless scribal error.

2624 *ἔστωσαν* B 15 55 ^{Lat}codd 91 94—96] *pr ισοι* 376 b 799; *ut sint aequales* ^{Lat}cod 102; *stantes* Arm; > 72 53' Aeth^C; + *ισοι* x; + *ισαι* 58-707-767 129 n 30' 527 Bo; *pr ισαι* rell

There is no basis in $\mathfrak{M}$ for any of the variant readings. $\mathfrak{M}$ reads: “for the two corners shall they be,” which is exactly translated by Exod. The popular variant *ισαι εστωσαν* arose due to a misunderstanding of the Exod text. It read οὕτως ποιήσεις ἀμφοτέραις, ταῖς δυσὶν γωνίαις ἔστωσαν. If one divides after *γωνίαις*, the insertion of *ισαι* becomes necessary. On the other hand, the presence of *ισοι* makes the reference to the *στῦλοι*, but again that is not what the parent text nor Exod said. The weak support for Exod in the tradition shows how wide spread the misunderstanding of Exod was.

2720 *φῶς*] + *καυσαι* B f x 392 55 76' 799 = Ra

The gloss occurs in the context: “oil . . . εἰς φῶς ἵνα καίηται λύχνος διὰ παντός. In $\mathfrak{M}$ the text has למאור להעלת נר תמיד; exactly the same phrase occurs at Lev 24² which LXX translated by εἰς φῶς καῦσαι λύχνον διὰ παντός. This is obviously the source in the tradition for the ill-fitting doublet in the variant Exodus tradition. That it is otiose is obvious; it can only be secondary.

2928 σωτηρίων] + των υιων ιηλ A^c B 82 f 71' 55 799 = Ra; + (✕Syh) αυτων M^{ms} O-58 d n
t 392 Latcodd 91 94—96 Aeth Arm Syh = M

The evidence for the gloss των υιων ιηλ is not as impressive as it might at first seem. The corrector of codex A is not first hand but rather a marginal corrector of later date, so that only B should be considered as an early, i.e. a fourth century A.D., witness. Moreover at the time of Origen it is almost certain that his text(s) did not contain it; he would hardly have added αυτων, if των υιων ιηλ were already in his parent text. Furthermore the phrase is redundant. Within the clause itself the phrase παρὰ τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ (2°) already obtains (this is the obvious source of the gloss), and repeating it substantially without the stimulus of a Hebrew source would be unexpected, whereas the simple disregard of the suffix of שמיהם is fully in accordance with Exod practice elsewhere. The shorter text is clearly preferable.

3010 ἐξιλιάσεται] + περι αυτου B*; + επ αυτου B^{c2} 129 426; + επ αυτο A^c B^{c1} (vid) M 15' 56
318-392^c 18 55 = Ra; + επ αυτω 53^(ms)-246-664 71' 392* 319 799

The prepositional phrase is an obtrusive gloss which is hardly original. The verb is modified by the phrase ἐπὶ τῶν κεράτων αὐτῶν, and another ἐπί phrase is otiose. The origin of the gloss probably lies in the frequency with which this verb is accompanied by it in other parts of the Greek O.T., particularly in Leviticus. The variant tradition probably began with the B* reading, since the verb is very often accompanied by a περί phrase to indicate on whose behalf atonement is being made. A subsequent "correction" changed the preposition, probably since there was no referent in the context for the pronoun in περι αυτου. By changing περι to επ the referent became the altar. Changes to the accusative or dative do not change the referent.

Since the source of the gloss seems to be other parts of the O.T., it is clear that it is secondary since Exod is demonstrably earlier.

3021 (ὑδατι) ἵνα μή] pr (+ η M 18) οταν εισπορευωνται (aut -ονται) εις την σκηνην του μαρτυριου (+ ου 376) νιψονται υδατι A B M 15'-58-376 129 18 55 = Ra; pr (cvar) οταν εισπορευωνται εις την σκηνην του μαρτυριου 767 Cⁿ-500^{ext} d⁽⁻¹⁰⁶⁾ n s t 71' 68'-120' 426

The popular variant is an old variant incorporated from v. 20. It has no basis in M, and its secondary character is quite clear from its intrusive nature in the context. It easily came in from v. 20 since exactly the same words precede: τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας ὑδατι. In v. 20, however, it fits the context. Moses had been told to make a laver and pour water into it. Then v. 19 states that Aaron and his sons shall wash out of it (i.e. the laver) their hands and feet with water. Then v. 20 states "whenever they enter the tent of witness and they will not die." The other possibility (or): "when they approach the altar to do service and to offer holocausts to the Lord, they shall wash their hands and feet with water lest they die." The insertion before the "lest" clause of the words of the popular variant is an obvious misfit of a kind that one can hardly attribute to the translator.

3110 ιερατεύειν μοι B 15-58 129 71' 55 426] > 72-707^l; pr εις το rell

The syntagm "εἰς plus articulated infinitive" is only rarely used by Exod (284 3634

38¹⁹ 39¹²) and in the first of these the source of the popular variant in 31¹⁰ is to be found. At 284 *εἰς τὸ ἱερατεῦν μοι* obtains (with mss 805 25 n⁻¹²⁷ 619* omitting *εἰς τὸ*), and the phrase stands in a similar context *στολὰς ἀγίας Ἀαρὼν καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ εἰς* The text of $\mathfrak{M}$ is fuller at 284: *לכהנו לי* (over against *לכהן*). The text of Exod is by no means certain, but it does seem easier to explain the variant text as a secondary accretion than the reverse process. Here the oldest witness probably retains the original text of Exod.

31¹⁴ *ὕμιν*] pr $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ B M 15 18 = Ra; pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ 82 426; pr $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ καὶ F^b 767 129 n⁻⁷⁵ 71' z Lat^{cod} 100 Arm Sa; pr (+ τω 422 53' 134) $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ καὶ (> 318) *εν* 29 C'' d f⁻¹²⁹ s t 318' 46 319 509 646' Bo; + $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ 75

The context refers to the sabbath and reads *ὅτι ἅγιον τοῦτό ἐστιν ὑμῖν*. $\mathfrak{M}$ reads *כִּי קֹדֶשׁ הוּא לָכֵן*. The popular reading which introduces $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ after *ἐστιν* is really ex par. Thus 16²³ has *ἀγία τῷ κυρίῳ*, 16²⁵ *σάββατα σήμερον τῷ κυρίῳ*, 20¹⁰ *σάββατα κυρίῳ*; 31¹⁵ (which is probably the actual source) has *ἀγία τῷ κυρίῳ*. With *ὕμιν* following it the gloss is awkward, and secondarily the B reading changed $\overline{\kappa\omega}$ to $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$. But the genitive never occurs in Exod in such a context, and its adoption is simply out of the question. Another solution to the awkwardness of *κυριω υμιν* was to add *καὶ εν* before the *υμιν*. The text of Exod was much simpler — and a good rendering of the Hebrew.

31¹⁵ *θανατωθήσεται* B 55^{ext}] pr (⊗ Arm^{mss}) *θανατω* rell = Ra $\mathfrak{M}$

Were it not for the evidence of the asterisk in Arm^{mss} one would not realize the fact that *θανατω* was added by hex. It is of course possible that it had fallen out due to homoiarchon from Origen's parent text, but with the evidence of B and 55^{ext}, both old witnesses, this would be an overly speculative suggestion, and the shorter text is likely original.

32³⁴ *βάδιζε*] *καταβηθι* f⁻¹²⁹ 799; + *καταβηθι* B 15' 73'-550' 129 71' 126-128'-628 426 Arm Sa = Ra; + *καὶ καταβηθι* M' 68'-120' 18 55; + . . .] *ταβηθι* 64^{mss}

There is no basis for a *καταβηθι* in $\mathfrak{M}$. The context reads *לך נחה* which is rendered by *βάδιζε καὶ ὁδήγησον*. The addition of *καταβηθι* is probably an intrusion from v. 7; cf also 19²⁴. It is certainly not original in spite of support by B.

33¹³ *ἐθνος*] + *το μεγα* A^c B F^a M' 15'-767 73'-550' b d 56-129-246^c n t 392 126-128'-407-628 18 55 426 799 Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth Arab Arm Co = Ra

There is no support in $\mathfrak{M}$, nor is there any obvious exegetical reason for the translator to add the gratuitous gloss. It was rather the influence of Deut 4⁶ in the tradition which created the variant. Though B already had the longer text, it should be noted that Origen's parent text did not. But the gloss must have entered the tradition at a fairly early time since it is quite widely attested. In spite of this widespread support it must be rejected as secondary to Exod.

34¹² *μή* 767 n 121 426] + *πως* 55 Bo; + *σοι* B 15' = Ra; + (⊗ Arm^{mss} Syh^L) *ποτε* rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

Ra's adoption of the reading *σοι* is puzzling, since it cannot possibly be correct.

The $\mathfrak{M}$ פן clause does have a second person reference in בקרבר , but this comes at the end of the clause and is rendered by the plural in Exod: ἐν ὑμῖν which Ra also accepts, thereby making an inconsistent text. Only the weakly supported $\mu\eta$ can be original in view of the fact that the ποτε of the majority text is hex as the asterisks demonstrate. In fact, Origen took it from the Three as the reading in App. II shows.

3415 $\text{τοῖς ἐγκαθημένοις}]$ pr *cum alienigenis* Sa; + προς αλλοφυλους A^c B 15 = Ra; + αλλοφυλοις 407

That a reference to the Philistines is a secondary gloss from a non-Pentateuchal source would seem obvious. According to HR ἀλλόφυλος occurs 296 times in the LXX of which 269 are renderings for פלשת , and 14 occur in Mac I—IV. The word does not occur at all in the Pentateuch. It must be an early (pre-Sahidic) exegetical gloss identifying $\text{τοῖς ἐγκαθημένοις ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς}$ as Philistines. The form which the gloss takes makes it particularly obvious that the variant adopted by Ra is secondary; a προς phrase fits the context badly; at least the Sa variant was better adapted to its environment.

378 fin B 15-64^{txt}-707 19' 129 392 55 426 ^{Lat}cod 100] + χαλκαι rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

In contrast to $\mathfrak{M}$ Exod does not specify the metals of which the components of the court, i. e. the pillars and the bases, were made. In fact, $\mathfrak{M}$ also lacks the designation for the west and east sides. Exod further shortens the account by omitting all references to the silver hooks and bands of the pillars here and also in vv. 9 and 10.

386 $\text{καὶ B 15-707 19' n 71' 392 68'-120' 55 426}$ ^{Lat}cod 100 Pal] + ἐποίησε(ν) rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

Exod abridges here as it did for the preceding verse, and the repetition of ἐποίησεν is unnecessary. It seems likely that the strong tradition adding the verb is based on an early hebraizing correction of the text rather than representing an original text inexplicably shortened by the B tradition.

3820 $\text{ἐποίησεν}]$ + τοῖς στύλοις B 15 129 527 55 426 ^{Lat}cod 100 = Ra

Since the context reads $\text{καὶ ἀγκύλας ἐποίησεν ἀργυρᾶς ἐπὶ τῶν στύλων}$, the variant plus of the B+ text is a doublet. Incidentally, it should be noted that Latin codex 100 omits ἐπὶ τῶν στύλων , i. e. its text simply involved a transposition and is not support for the doublet. Also of interest is the fact that 71', two mss related to B, have τοῖς στύλ(λ)οις instead of ἐπὶ τῶν στύλων . In any event, the translator would hardly have written both.

394 $\text{κεφαλίδων}]$ pr ἐκατον B 15-29 56^c-129-246 71' z 46 55 Arm = Ra

The word ἐκατόν occurs three times in vv. 4 and 5 (cf $\mathfrak{M}$ 3827) but not here in either $\mathfrak{M}$ or Exod. The total sum of 100 talents is mentioned at the beginning as constituting the amount of silver available for casting the κεφαλίδες (oddly for the אֲדָנִים) of the tent and of the veil, and v. 5 continues with 100 κεφαλίδες for the 100 talents. The insertion of ἐκατον before "capitals of the tent" is otiose and clearly not Exod.

P. At times the later tradition has lost part of the original text. In this section instances are discussed in which the text of Exod is longer than the variant tradition.

33 τί ὅτι] om τί B 58-376-oII⁻¹³⁵ b 129-246 x 68'-120' 55* Lat^{codd} 100 101

That the shorter text is secondary is quite obvious. $\mathfrak{M}$ has מְדוּעַ which is correctly rendered by τί ὅτι but would be quite wrongly interpreted by ὅτι. The word מְדוּעַ occurs elsewhere at 1¹⁸ 2¹⁸ 5¹⁴ 18¹⁴. The first two are rendered by τί ὅτι, whereas the last two are translated by διὰ τί. The variant text has received a fairly wide support, since without reference to a Hebrew parent it would make good sense as a causal particle.

38 om καὶ εἰσαγαγεῖν αὐτοῦς A F M O'⁻⁵⁸-29'-135 C''⁻⁵⁷ 56^{txt} s 121' 18 59 130 509 799 Arab Bo Syh^{L^{txt}} = $\mathfrak{M}$

$\mathfrak{M}$ says "to bring them out of that land into a good and broad land." Exod with pedantic exactness inserts "and to bring them in" before "into." Of course it means the same but Exod clarifies that they are *brought out* from one country and *brought into* another one, exactly the kind of exegetical nicety which often characterizes the translator's work. The shorter text is then the result of an early (preOrigenian) hebraizing correction.

32 ἀλλὰ] > A B 15' 129 628 Lat^{cod} 100 Aeth^P Sa = Ra

For ἀλλὰ αἰτήσῃ $\mathfrak{M}$ has וְשָׁאַלָה. I am sceptical about the originality of the shorter text, since the translator tends precisely to this kind of stylistic intervention. The translation with ἀλλὰ is excellent since the particle introduces the explanation for the preceding clause. Exod uses ἀλλὰ (or ἀλλ' ἢ) sparingly; it occurs elsewhere only 11 times but for a motley lot of equivalents in the text of $\mathfrak{M}$. As in 3²² it represents the *waw* in 9² 16²⁰ 21¹³. At 8²⁸ it stands for קָרָה; at 10²⁵ ἀλλὰ καὶ is used for גַּם; it represents כִּי אֵם at 12⁹, but כִּי alone in 16⁸ 23²⁴. At 23⁵ $\mathfrak{M}$ is not the parent text of Exod; at 32¹⁸ ἀλλὰ is gratuitously introduced, whereas at 33¹⁶ $\mathfrak{M}$ has הִלּוּא. Furthermore the translator seldom fails to take note of *waw*, and here it must have been rendered by ἀλλὰ.

41 οὖν] > B 15'-64* C'' 19' 129 527 z Arm Bo

44 ἐκτείνας οὖν A B 843 15' 129 Phil I 108] καὶ ἐκτείνας rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

In both cases the οὖν particle is clearly original text. The word οὖν was a favorite of this translator in rendering narrative prose. In fact, it occurs 29 times in Exod (1¹⁰ 2²⁰ 3¹⁶ 18 4¹ 4²³ twice 5³ 5¹⁶ 18 8¹⁰ 17 19 28 9² 17 19 28 10¹⁷ 11² 14⁶ 18¹⁹ 22⁹ 27 32²⁶ 33⁵ 13). It might be noted that at 44, though οὖν is supported by only a few witnesses, they do include all the oldest extant Greek witnesses: A B 843 and Phil.

411 om κύριος 2° B 82-426 68'-120' Arm = Ra

Exod has οὐκ ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεός for $\mathfrak{M}$ הֲלֹא אֲנִי יְהוָה. The whole point of the question is self-identification: Am I not Yahweh? — and not as the variant text has it "Am I not God"? Exod has expanded this with ὁ θεός, but the κύριος as standard rendering

of the tetragrammaton must be original here. Whether Exod's parent also had אלהים is uncertain, since the translator might have wanted to emphasize Yahweh as deity in this context on his own.

55 om τῆς γῆς B 15' z 799 Sa* = Ra

The Hebrew phrase עַם הָאָרֶץ is unique here in the book of Exodus and is admittedly a difficult phrase. Ordinarily, it means the common people, but as a designation by Pharaoh for the Israelites it is unexpected. The difficulty, however, is not in the translation; Exod has simply ὁ λαὸς τῆς γῆς. But in the tradition the influence of the very frequently occurring "the people" easily created the shorter text. Note also the small support for the variant text.

622 Μισαήλ καί] om καί 82 126 106-125 628 30' x 120'-122 646'; om Μισαήλ 527 Arab; > A B 707 19' f n 392 130 Latcod 100 Ach Sa = Ra

The shorter text is unlikely to be correct in spite of its support by the two oldest codices, A and B. The shorter text is palaeographically inspired. Μισαήλ follows Ὁζιήλ and the homoioteleuton gave rise to the omission of Μισαήλ, followed by an automatic adjustment of the deletion of καί. This first stage in the production of the shorter text is illustrated by the text of ms 527 and Arab.

75 ἐγὼ εἶμι] om εἶμι F 15-135-376'-oI C''(-77) s 121 68' 55 59 76' 646 Latcod 100 Syh

The Hebrew text has אֲנִי, and is the subject of a nominal clause. אֲנִי/אֲנִי occurs 26(27) times in such a syntagm (in one of these אֲנִי is one element in a compound subject), most of which consisting of the formulaic pattern אֲנִי יְהוָה. Three of these (311 410 2227) have the pronoun rendered by εἶμι. The remaining 23(24) cases are equally divided between ἐγὼ and ἐγὼ εἶμι. In only nine instances is the text tradition unanimous. Since the translator was quite indifferent as to whether to use the one or the other, one had best follow the oldest witness, and in each case the text of Ra has been adopted.

77 om ὁ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ F M^{ext} O''-82 C'' b d n s t 121 68' 18 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = ℣

Aaron is characterized as Moses' brother ten times in Exod (414 712 79 19 85 2812 295), and in the other nine cases the critical text is never in doubt. But in only five cases (414 712 2812) does it have a basis in ℣. Clearly it was a favorite expansion of the part of Exod, and it is plausible to adopt the expanded text as original here as well.

79 om ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν F M O''-82 C'' b 107'-125 s x 121' 18 55 59 76' 509 646' Aeth Arab Bo Syh = ℣

℣ is extremely terse here having only "cast before Pharaoh." B 53' read ῥῖψον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν (ἐναντίον Φαραώ), all other witnesses adding αὐτήν after ῥῖψον. Ra adopts ῥῖψον αὐτήν ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν . . . as text. No Greek text reads the terse text of ℣, and it might be argued that either αὐτήν or ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν is necessary for clarity but not both. Since only B 53' lack αὐτήν, this is likely to have been part of the translator's work.

But the prepositional phrase is probably also original, since the translator often levels out the text to agree with a counterpart. The original account in 4₃ has the phrase, and in the recapitulation of the event before Pharaoh the translator repeated it as well so as to make the accounts more alike. The shorter text is probably an early hebraizing correction in the direction of the Hebrew.

720 (ἐπάρας) Ἀαρών] > B 15-72-707 129 127-628 Arm Sa* Syh = Ra **ℳ**

Though the subject is not named in **ℳ** it is clear from v. 19 that it is Aaron and not Moses who raises the rod and smites the water. The express identification is characteristic of the translator who regularly helps the reader to avoid making even momentarily a wrong interpretation of the text by making explicit what is only implicit in the parent text. The omission of Ἀαρών would then probably be a later hebraizing correction in the tradition.

Whether the verb should be modified by the dative τῇ ῥάβδῳ as Ra or by the accusative τὴν ῥάβδον is not immediately clear. The dative is supported by B F M 15-58-135-376-707-ο I d 129 s t⁻⁸⁴ 370^c x 121 68'-120' 55* 319 509, with all the other Greek witnesses attesting to the grammatically correct accusative. The dative can only be a Hebraism, **ℳ** having במטה; the accusative must then be a later scribal stylistic correction.

The verb ἐπαίρω only occurs three times elsewhere in Exod. At 10₁₃ 14₁₆ the object is τὴν ῥάβδον; in the latter case B and 129 have τῇ ραβδῳ which cannot be correct in spite of Ra, since there is no excuse as at 720 of a Hebrew parent with a ב phrase; **ℳ** has את מטה. At 17₁₁ the modifier is τὰς χειρας with no dative variants in the tradition.

822 ὁ κύριος B x Arm Pal Sa] om ὁ n⁻¹²⁷ 392 799; ο θεος A 29-82 b d t 121 z 130 509 646 Arab Bo; > rell: cf **ℳ**

The context reads ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς for **ℳ**: אני יהוה בקרב הארץ. This text, which Ra also adopted, is almost certainly the original translation. The popular text which omits ὁ κύριος cannot possibly be the original text. The translator would hardly have rendered the tetragrammaton by the usual κύριος and then בקרב הארץ by πάσης τῆς γῆς, thereby completely misrepresenting the Hebrew. The popular text is rather the result of parablepsis due to homoioteleuton. The change of ὁ κύριος to ο θεος in the A text tradition represents a stylistic correction within the Greek tradition.

912 (καθὰ συνέταξεν κύριος) τῷ Μωυσῇ] > B 82' f⁻²⁴⁶ n⁻⁶²⁸ x 392 120'-128' 799 = Ra

Usage in Exod is clear. Whenever a subordinate καθὰ (or καθάπερ) clause contains a verb of ordering (i.e. ἐντέλλομαι or συντάσσω) it always specifies the addressee in the dative, regardless of the situation in **ℳ**. The καθὰ clauses are found in 9₁₂ 12₂₈ 35 50 36₈ 12 14 28 34 37₂₀ 39₁₁ 40₁₇, and καθάπερ clauses, in 7₆ 10 20 16₂₄ 23₁₅ 34₁₈ 38₂₇ 40₂₅. On the other hand, if such a clause contains a verb of saying (εἶπεν or λαλεῖν) the addressee is not necessarily given (7₂₂ 8₁₃ 15 19 31). The longer text, which also = **ℳ**, is here preferable.

914 om ἄλλος A M Oⁿ⁻⁸² Cⁿ d 246* n s t x y 55 59 76' 509 646 Aeth Arm Pal Sa Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

$\mathfrak{M}$ has אין כמני which Exod expands as οὐκ ἔστιν ὡς ἐγὼ ἄλλος. There is a similar statement in 810 οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν κυρίου for אין כיהוה; in other words Hebrew “there is not (one) like” is idiomatically rendered by “there is no other like.” The popular shorter text is an attempt in the tradition to “correct” the Greek by omitting ἄλλος thereby getting closer to the Hebrew. The longer and more idiomatic rendering is likely to be original.

925 om ἡ χάλαζα 3° A* M Oⁿ⁻⁸² Cⁿ⁽⁻¹⁶⁾ b 106 s y⁻³¹⁸ 128' 18 55 59 76' 509 646' Aeth Arab Arm Bo Pal = $\mathfrak{M}$

Though the subject of the clause is not specified in $\mathfrak{M}$, it is known from the preceding clause to be הברד. So too in Exod the preceding clause ends with (ἐπάταξεν) ἡ χάλαζα. But both clauses have the inverted order with the accusative modifier coming first, followed by a modifier, and then the verb. Exod's repetition of the subject is fairly typical of his style. If any ambiguity might momentarily appear in the text, he clarifies. In this case the ambiguity lies in the initial accusative. The pattern is τὰ ξύλα . . . συνέτριψεν. The accusative could grammatically also be taken as a nominative, i.e. as subject, and Exod makes it all clear by repeating the subject. Its subsequent omission is likely to be recensional.

106 om Μωσῆς A M 72-376-oIⁿ⁻⁸² C^{n(-54 126)} 121 68' 18 55 59 76' 509 Arab Arm Bo Pal Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

Though $\mathfrak{M}$ does not name the subject, the translator adds it, because the subject changes at this point. Theoretically it could be misunderstood momentarily, and he is careful to prevent this remote possibility. The text was later shortened so as to conform to the Hebrew, i.e. a prehexaplaric (?) revision created the majority text.

1243 om λέγων A F M 72-426-oI^{n-15'} Cⁿ b s x 121 68' 18 59 76' 424 509 Latcod 101 Aeth Arab Bo Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$

There seems to be no particular consistency with respect to the use of λέγων. Usually it is not present after εἶπεν (11 times) or after ἐλάλησεν (12 times). It follows a variety of verbs (16) in Exod but always introduces direct speech in the same way as לאמר in $\mathfrak{M}$. Such a Hebraism is probably based on a parent text with לאמר rather than a free addition by the translator, and its omission in the tradition is then a hebraizing correction. Cf discussion on 151 below.

1312 ἀγιάσεις] > A* F M^{txt} 29'-72-135-426-oI b 121 68' 18 46 59 76' 509 Phil I 239 244 Aeth Arab Syh = $\mathfrak{M}$ Sam Tar^P

A good case could indeed be made for the shorter text; it has support in such old witnesses as Phil, A and F and it equals $\mathfrak{M}$ as well. On the other hand, it was an old Hebrew tradition as the תקדיש of Tar^O shows. Furthermore the occurrence of τὰ ἀρσενικά after the ὅσα clause makes a verb highly desirable; in any event, one must take τὰ ἀρσενικά as accusative, and a verbal idea must be understood, either the ἀφε-

λεις of V. a or some such word as *ἀγιάσεις*. The shorter variant text is probably an early revision based on acquaintance with the Hebrew text.

151 λέγοντες B F 58-64^{mg}-707 131^(mg) 118'-537 d x 392-527 Aeg] λεγειν 29-64^{txt}-426-708 t 120 55 Bo; (+ εν 82 509) τω λεγειν A 82-376 121 68' 509 Syh; ωδην λεγων 318; > rell

ℳ has לאמר. This word occurs 50 times in Exodus and it is always rendered in Exod by a form of λέγων except once (36s) where it was added by Origen under the asterisk. So one can be quite certain about the critical text here; λέγοντες must be original. The reverse is not true. Exod has λέγων or a form of the participle to introduce direct speech 71 times, i. e. in 22 cases Exod has no לאמר as equivalent in ℳ. Of these, however, 11 have a finite form of the root אמר such as ויאמר (210 22 34 825 1016 24 1723 183 243 32s), whereas the remaining 11 (312 66 71 98 101 1243 1521 186 1921 327 13) have no equivalent. This does not mean that the parent text was necessarily longer than ℳ. The translator used the participle to introduce direct speech in the same way as ℳ did, and in each case it is direct speech being introduced, i. e. it simply shows that the translator understood his text.

1523 om ὕδωρ B 82 129 120-628-630 Aeth^C = Ra

It is most unlikely that the translator did not render מים to follow πειν. Throughout Exod the verb normally has the word ὕδωρ in its context. The absolute use of the verb occurs only in obvious contexts, viz. "eat and drink" (2411 326) and in the question "what shall we drink?". The shorter text may well be due to the fact that at the end of v. 22 ὥστε πειν has been added by the translator to the clause οὐχ εὐρισκον ὕδωρ; i. e. a scribe had just written ὥστε πειν without ὕδωρ following, and did so here as well. Cf also 718 21 24 twice 1726.

2410 om ἐκεῖ B O-15-618*-707 b 129 n⁽⁻⁴⁵⁸⁾ s x γ⁻³⁹² 55 509 646' Phil II 218 294 Latcodd 102 et T: 91 94-96 Arm Syh

The word occurs in the context of καὶ εἶδον τὸν τόπον οὗ εἰστήκει ἐκεῖ ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ἰσραήλ, a theological rewrite for the Hebrew ויראו את אלהי ישראל. It would seem obvious that ἐκεῖ could only have come from someone writing or composing Greek in a Semitic context. The ἐκεῖ is, of course, a Hebraism in which שם . . . אשר is understood as οὗ . . . ἐκεῖ. It would be difficult to ascribe the ἐκεῖ to a Greek scribe, to whom ἐκεῖ within a οὗ clause would appear barbarous. The fact that Phil does not attest to the ἐκεῖ should hardly be taken as strong evidence since to the pseudoclassical tastes of Philo the ἐκεῖ would also be unattractive. The omission of the adverb in the variant tradition is simply the result of a scribe improving the Greek style.

3019 ὕδατι A^{mg} B 15' 129 318' 55 319 426 Latcod 100] pr εν f⁻¹²⁹ 799; > rell = ℳ

The word occurs as a modifier of νίπεται immediately following τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας. ℳ simply has את ידיהם ואת רגליהם, i. e. without a correspondent to ὕδατι. In v. 21 the same situation obtains except that ℳ does not have the preposition את with the nouns. Again Exod does not translate the pronominal suffixes but adds

ὑδατι. It should be noted that M 29-58-376-oI 121 126-128-628 18 46 59 509 Aeth Arab^(mg) Arm Bo Syh omit ὑδατι in v.21.

The intervening verse has νίψονται ὑδατι but there it has a basis in $\mathfrak{M}$ which has ירחצו מים. The verb is first found in v.18 where Moses is ordered to make a laver of bronze ὥστε νίπτεσθαι “for washing himself.” Only at the end of the verse is he told ἐκχεεῖς εἰς αὐτὸν ὕδωρ. Once the water has been added, the translator insists that the washing is “with water” regardless of whether his parent text had it or not.

The only other instances of νίπτεσθαι in Exod occur in 38²⁷ (twice). Neither in Exod nor in $\mathfrak{M}$ (40^{31 32}) is there any reference made to water in the context.

3319 The clause καλέσω ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι μου Κύριος ἐναντίον σου has created a great deal of confusion in the tradition. Note the following variants:

- ἐπὶ B 15' 73'-550' b 407 55] εν F^b O-⁷⁶⁷ Arm Bo Syh^{L^{txt}T} = $\mathfrak{M}$; > rell
- μου B 15-58^{txt}-707-708^c-767 cI-⁵⁷ b d-⁶¹⁰ 129-246 n-¹²⁷ t 121^c-318 407-628-630 55 426 ^{Lat}codd 100 103] σου 610; > rell = $\mathfrak{M}$
- κύριος B 15-707 73'-550' 129 407 ^{Lat}codd 100 103] $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ F^b 58^{txt}-708-767 413 b d 56*-246 n t 71' 121^c-318 628-630 426; > 55; $\overline{\kappa\upsilon}$ rell

The popular text is καλεσω τω ονοματι κυριου εναντιον σου, which is much close to $\mathfrak{M}$ than to Exod. $\mathfrak{M}$ has יהוה לפניך וקראתי בשם. It might be considered a good candidate for the critical text except that it would be difficult to explain the intrusion of ἐπὶ and μου. And if μου is original text, then κυριου is most unlikely. But if ἐπὶ is original, then μου must be, since otherwise God would be calling upon the name of the Lord, which could never be correct. It would seem that both ἐπὶ and μου must be taken as original text. Then comes the question of the case of κύριος. The genitive which is the most widely supported text cannot be correct, so that only the nominative and accusative are viable possibilities. The nominative is probably to be preferred since it would be more difficult to imagine scribes changing an original accusative to a nominative than the reverse. The nominative is only conceivable as the original form used by the translator, as a stock form in the sense of “I will call out with my name ‘Κύριος’ before you.”

344 om τὸ πρῶτ B 15 129 71' 55 Sa = Ra

The phrase modifies ὀρθρίσας, which in turn renders וישכם. The verb השכים occurs only five times in Exodus, but it is always modified by a word for morning. In 8¹⁶ 9¹³ בבקר השכם occurs and each time is rendered by ὀρθρῖσον τὸ πρῶτ. At 24⁴ and 34⁴ the verb is also modified by בבקר and Exod has ὀρθρίσας . . . τὸ πρῶτ. At 32⁶ the verb is modified by ממחרת and Exod has ὀρθρίσας τῇ ἐπαύριον. In view of the consistent pattern obtaining throughout the book it seems unlikely that the translator would have failed to render בבקר here. The variant may simply be based on a stylistic avoidance of a seeming tautology in the text.

346 κύριος 3°] > B 15'-767 54-73* d 53' n-¹²⁷ 85 x 318 55 59 319 426 509 799 ^{Lat}codd 100 103 Aeth Arab Arm = Ra

There is no good reason for supporting the shorter text when it can be explained as a simple haplograph. The text of $\mathfrak{M}$ has the word repeated, and the majority of

witnesses have the reading which equals $\mathfrak{M}$. Here $\mathfrak{M}$ has יהוה יהוה which Exod renders by κύριος κύριος, and the variant reading is simply the result of a scribal mistake.

3613 καὶ ἐκκεκολλαμμένους (cvar) A* B 15'-58 56'-129 71' 68'-120' 55 319 799] ἐγκεκολλημενας 72; om ἐκκεκ. F^h; > rell

The context reads γεγλυμμένους καὶ ἐκκεκολλαμμένους ἐκκόλλαμα σφραγίδος — “carved and engraved as an engraving of a seal.” $\mathfrak{M}$ has a single word for the coordinate participles, מפתחת, which then was modified by פתוחי חותם, i. e. $\mathfrak{M}$ has a cognate modifier after the participle. This would presumably find an excellent rendering in ἐκκεκολλαμμένους ἐκκόλλαμα. The two participles in Exod are of course a doublet translation, and one might well conclude that the original text was the majority reading of the shorter text and that the καὶ ἐκκεκολλαμμένους was a hebraizing correction, i. e. introducing a cognate form to equal $\mathfrak{M}$. There are two reasons for questioning such a reconstruction. First of all, the pattern of support for the longer text which though not extensive does contain excellent witnesses; note the support of both B and 55. Furthermore the shorter text can be easily explained as produced by parablepsis due to homoioteleuton, both participles ending in -μμενους.

382 om καὶ 3° — fin B 15-707 19' 44 n 392 55 426 Latcodd 100 104 = Ra

This is a case of parablepsis from καὶ 3° to 383 καὶ 1°, and is hardly to be taken seriously. Only an exaggerated view of B's importance as a witness could induce anyone to regard the shorter text as original. $\mathfrak{M}$ has ויעש לו זר זהב סביב, and this is well rendered by the above clause in Exod. The only technical term in the clause, κυμᾶτιον for זר, is well-known in Exod, occurring in 2510 23 24 as well. Thus there is no occasion for thinking this clause to be a hex addition.

385 om καθαροῦ B 15 19' x 55 426 Pal = Ra

That Exod should have rendered זהב מהור by ἐκ χρυσίου would be strange indeed. The Hebrew phrase occurs 24 times in the two accounts. In four cases the phrase is not translated. Sometimes Exod uses an adjective (2523 2832 3633 3816 17) but only at 2832 is the מהור also translated. All other cases are translated simply by the noun (χρυσίῳ or χρυσίου), and in all 13 cases καθαρῶ/καθαροῦ also occurs. That the B x + shorter text is here secondary seems an inescapable conclusion. Its omission was originally probably due to homoioteleuton.

3810 om χρυσοῦς B 15-29-707^{lat} 46 = Ra

The context is καὶ ἐχώνευσεν αὐτῇ τέσσαρας δακτυλίους χρυσοῦς. Since the verb χωνεύω refers to casting of metals, the χρυσοῦς is expected. The verb is used five times in Exod (2637 38310 18 20) and the metal is always named. Here χρυσοῦς does equal $\mathfrak{M}$ as well, but in view of the free abridgement in which the translator indulges this may not be significant. Actually, the variant was palaeographically inspired; the omission is due to homoioteleuton, the preceding word ending in -ους as well.

392^o om καὶ τὰς βάσεις αὐτῆς B 15-707^{txt} 19' 129 n 71' 392 55 426 ^{Lat}codd 100 103 = Ra

The relevant phrase represents ואת ארניה of $\mathfrak{M}$. It would be quite wrong to consider the phrase a hex restoration. It is rather an omission, a parablepsis within the Greek textual tradition, καὶ 3° ∩ 4°. Both the preceding element (the pillars) and the succeeding one (the veil) obtain both in $\mathfrak{M}$ and in Exod in the list comprising “hangings, pillars, bases and the veil,” and the shorter text ought not to be seriously considered as original text.

Q. Lexemic changes in the tradition.

322 σκυλεύετε] -σατε B; -σητε 72; συσκευασατε M 426-618 16-52-126-552 *b d*⁻⁴⁴ 458 343 370 *x* 527 18 55; συνσκευασατε F 30; συνσκευασετε F^b 29* 730; συσκευασετε A 15-29^c-64'-82'-376 Cⁿ-16 52 126 131^c 422 552 44 56* 85'-127-344 *t*⁻³⁷⁰ *y*⁻⁵²⁷ *z* 76' 130 509 799; συσκευασητε 422(vid) 628; συσκυλευετε 131^c 75; επισυνσκευασατε 53'-246; επισυνσκευασετε 56^c-129; αποσυνσκευασετε 59

Exod has only little support in the tradition, but it must be original text. $\mathfrak{M}$ and the context demand the meaning of “despoil” in the future. The verb συσκευάζω means “to pack up (baggage)” and, though supported by most Greek witnesses in a wide variety of forms, must be based on an early scribal error. Ra was quite correct in taking σκυλεύετε as original text.

418 λέγει A B 15'-707 *b f x* 392 *z* 799 Ach Sa] ειπε(ν) rell = $\mathfrak{M}$

The translator was apparently fond of the historical present of this verb, though the more literal rendering by the aorist is much more common. The λέγει inflection occurs 15 times in Exod (213 418 10⁹ 28 29 18¹⁴ 15 20²⁰ 32² 17 18 27 33¹⁴ 15 18). Examination of these passages gives no clue as to why he should have used the present in these cases but not in others.

It should be noted that the “correction” to ειπεν in the tradition also involved the addition of αυτω which is also = $\mathfrak{M}$. It is attested by all except A B 15'-707 551* *b* 56'-129 392 *z* 799 Ach Sa. Apparently ειπεν αυτω is hexaplaric.

420 ἐπέστρεψεν] απεστρ. F M 29-58-64'-135-376-381*-618 Cⁿ-126 *b d* 628 *s t*⁻⁸⁴ *x y*⁻³⁹² 128' 18 55 59 76' 509; ανεστρ. 426 126 *n*⁻⁶²⁸; υπεστρ. 72-381^c *f*⁻¹²⁹ 84 130 799

Either ἐπιστρέφω or ἀποστρέφω could render the Qal of שׁוּב equally well. The Qal of שׁוּב occurs 18 times in Exodus, but in only nine cases does Exod render it by either of these two compounds. In the following only the evidence concerning these two compounds is given.

418 ἀπέστρεψεν] επεστρ. A 426-707 537^c 321^c 318 59
418 ἀποστρέψω] επιστρ. 426
421 ἀποστρέφοντος] επιστρ. 426
522 ἐπέστρεψεν] απεστρ. 54^c 75 392 76' 799
1317 ἀποστρέψη
142 ἀποστρέψαντες
3231 ἐπέστρεψεν] απεστραφη 767 Cⁿ-551-57' 127 30'-85'^{txt}-130^{txt}-343'-346^{txt}; απεστρ. 707 *n*⁻¹²⁷ 527 318 426; cf also υπεστρ. B 15' *f*⁻¹²⁹ 68'-120' 55 799 = Ra
3431 ἐπεστράφησαν] απεστρ. 767 550'

From this it would appear that ἀποστρέφω occurs five times and ἐπιστρέφω three times. No particular pattern obtains, so the text tradition alone must decide. Since both A and B support ἐπέστρεψαν, it has been adopted as original text. One might note that at 32₃₁ Ra adopted υπεστρεψεν on the basis of B. This is most unlikely to be original. The verb ὑποστρέφω is never used in the Pentateuch to render שׁוּב, and one suspects that it is rooted in scribal error, i.e. an *upsilon* for an *epsilon* (or *alpha*). Since the other three oldest witnesses (A F M) all support ἐπέστρεψεν, that compound has been adopted for Exod.

The opposite choice has been made at

10₈ ἀπέστρεψαν B 82 b 56'-129 619 76'] -ψε(ν) 72 53'; ανεστρ. 426; επεστρ. (-ψε 552* 85* 59*) rell

Here מ has וישוב, i.e. the Hophal of שׁוּב. This is interpreted by Exod as Hiphil. Unfortunately, usage gives no clear guide lines in this case. Both compounds appear for the Qal as stated above, but for the Hiphil ἀποστρέφειν occurs only at 23₄ where the finite verb occurs but preceded by its cognate free infinitive; this is rendered by ἀποστρέψας ἀποδώσεις. In fact, the Hiphil of שׁוּב is never rendered by the same verb more than twice in Exod (εἰσφέρω, ἐπάγω, ἀναφέρω, δίδωμι, ἀποδίδωμι, ἀποστρέφω and περιτίθημι for nine occurrences of השׁיב). The Hophal occurs only here in Exodus. There seems to be no compelling argument for the majority text, so it seems wise to let the oldest witness decide.

5₈ πλινθείας] πλινθουργίας (cvar) A F F^b M 29'-135-376'-oI C" b d 344^m t γ z 18 59 76' 509 646 Lat^ccod 100 Arm Syh

The reading πλινθείας is clearly original, whereas the popular variant is due to the influence of the preceding verse. There, however, מ has ללכן הלבנים — “for making bricks,” i.e. πλινθουργίαν, whereas here it is simply הלבנים. The daily quota does not refer to the work itself but rather to the product, the bricks.

51₁ οὐθέν] ουδεν O 54-126-414' 118'-537 n x 68*(vid) 59 76'

Usage in Exod is as follows: 21₂ οὐδένα] ουθENA 527; 8₃₁ οὐδεμία omnes; 9₆ οὐδέν] ουθεν Oxf 4; 9₇ οὐδέν] ουθεν 707; 10₁₅ οὐδέν] ουθεν 527; 10₂₃ (1°) οὐδεῖς omnes; 10₂₃ (2°) οὐδεῖς] ουθεις 29 d-⁶¹⁰ 129 t 392-527 120; 34₂₄ οὐθείς] ουθεις B 15'-58' f n-¹²⁷ 407 55 426 799 = Ra.

According to Mayser I 1.148 f the aspirated form dominated in the Ptolemaic papyri; in fact, in the third century B.C. only 14 instances out of 111 were attested for οὐδεῖς over against 97 for οὐθεις.

The principle followed in establishing the critical text is that οὐθεις was chosen if there was credible support in the mss, viz. at 51₁ and 34₂₄, but the tenuis form wherever it almost completely dominated the tradition. An exception was made at 10₂₃. There οὐδεῖς occurs twice, the first case being supported by all witnesses. It would seem reasonable to assume that the translator would not have used both spellings within adjacent clauses; accordingly οὐδεῖς has also been adopted for the second case even though 14 mss support ουθεις.

2017 οὔτε 1° B F M 707 18 46 55] ου 53; ουδε rel
 — οὔτε 2° B F M 707 25^c 18 46 55 799] ουδε rel
 — οὔτε 3° B F M 707 106 84 18 46 55 799] ουδε rel

Though ουδε is in each case the popular variant οὔτε is clearly preferable. It should be noted that οὔτε occurs four more times, in all cases in the sense of “nor” after the initial οὐκ ἐπιθυμήσεις τὴν οἰκίαν τοῦ πλησίον σου. **℣** has the simple conjunction *wa* in each case (except οὔτε 6° which introduces παντὸς κτήνους αὐτοῦ and is absent in **℣**). The evidence for ουδε variants for these succeeding four instances of οὔτε is as follows:

οὔτε 4°] ουδε 29 44 75 130-321-343' 527 120'-128'-628 426
 οὔτε 5°] ουδε 29 44 343' 527 128'-628 426
 οὔτε 6°] ουδε 29 343' 527
 οὔτε 7°] ουδε 29 120'; ουδ 55; ουθ 58' 128'-628 426 799

Were ουδε to be chosen for 1° 2° and 3° and οὔτε for the remainder as the popular text suggests ουδε would start a series and οὔτε continue it which is rare indeed, whereas the reverse, i.e. ουτε continued by ουδε was common. For N.T. the only credible instance of ουδε continued by an ουτε is Gal 112, with the ουτε well represented by ουδε in the tradition. The loss of distinction between the two forms did obtain in later Greek as the text tradition of LXX easily demonstrates, but this is much later, i.e. fourth century A.D. and later. There is little possible doubt that οὔτε must be read for 1° 2° and 3°.

518 πορευθέντες] απελθ. A F M O" C" b d 85^{ms} t x y z 18 55 59 76' 130 509 646'

The context is πορευθέντες ἐργάζεσθε for the Hebrew לכו עבדו. Whenever לך or לכו occurs to introduce another imperative, Exod usually uses either the root πορεύω (57¹¹ 118 108¹¹ 1232 331) or βαδίζω (419 1024 1231 1924 327 34). The only other renderings are δεῦρο at 310, ἐλθὼν at 316 and ἐλθόντες at 825. In other words, ἀπέρχομαι never occurs, and Ra was fully justified in choosing the minority reading of B as original text.

613 ὥστε ἐξαποστεῖλαι B 82 f 68'-120'] ινα εξαγαγη (aut -γει) 707 19' 527; ωστε εξαγαγειν rel = **℣**

The popular reading is a correction towards the להוציא of the Hebrew. To understand Exod one must see the larger context. **℣** has ויצום אל בני ישראל ואל פרעה מלך מצרים להוציא את בני ישראל. Exod apparently rendered a shorter text. In any event, it has συνέταξεν αὐτοῖς πρὸς Φαραὼ βασιλέα Αἰγύπτου ὥστε ἐξαποστεῖλαι τοὺς υἱοὺς Ἰσραήλ. By giving the orders to Pharaoh alone rather than to both the Israelites and Pharaoh the emphasis falls on Pharaoh and the subject of the infinitive is most easily understood as being Pharaoh. Pharaoh of course did not nor could he be expected to bring out the Israelites — only Moses and Aaron were commissioned to do that — hence a hebraizing corrector (prehexaplaric) changed the infinitive to conform to the Hebrew. Eventually Origen added πρὸς τοὺς υἱοὺς ἰηλ̄ και under the asterisk before πρὸς Φαραώ. Cf also v.27.

714 βεβάρυνται] βεβαρηται A B 82-381^c 16-313'-615 537 610 f-53 x 527 120'-128' 55^c = Ra; -ρεται 126; -ρνται 29-58' C"-16 126 313' 414' 615 19 125' 53 730^c 318 68' 59 319^c 424 646'

The roots βαρύνω and βαρέω are semantically indistinguishable. The problem here is that -ντ- tends to become -ττ- and the forms are then homonymous. This can be traced in the variety of spellings that obtain in the mss: note *βεβαρυνται* supported by 32 mss, whereas ms 44 reads *βεβαρηνται*. So an original *βεβαρηται* could easily become *βεβαρυνται*, as well as vice versa.

Outside of the perfect inflection the problems of audible confusion do not arise. Other forms of the root βαρύνω do occur in the Exod tradition at 59 815 32 97 34. The root βαρέω does not occur at all. In fact, it is not attested in the LXX anywhere, only appearing as a variant reading in A and 55 at Macc II 139, though it is frequent in the N.T. The reading of *βεβάρυνται* must be the original text.

92 ἀλλ'] και A M O⁻⁵⁸-15-29-135 118'-537 d n⁻¹²⁷ s t 121 18 55 59 509 Aeth Syh = ℞

The B reading is much more idiomatic, since the two clauses clearly contrast, whereas the *και* reading is Hebraic. Since the translator on the whole tends to idiomatic Greek, the *και* seems secondary, i.e. a hebraizing correction in the tradition. The popular variant is supported by the Byzantine text as well as by O (though not by Arm!) and may well be recensional in character.

915 θανάτῳ] θανατωσω A^c B 29-58'-82 413 b d f⁻⁵⁶ t x 392-527 z 76' 130 509 799

The well-supported variant is an error based on the context. Since *πατάξω σε και τον λαόν σου* immediately preceded it and *και εκτριβήσῃ* follows it, the change to a future verbal inflection was almost inevitable. That it is secondary a glance at the Hebrew בדר shows.

101 ἐβάρυνα] εσκληρυνα B M^{ms} 29-58'-64^{ms}-82-135^{ms} d 56-129 85'^{ms}-343-344^{ms} t x 120-128' 509 = Ra; σκληρυνω 53' Bo^A

Usage seems to favor *ἐβάρυνα* as the translator's choice. The verb *σκληρύνω* occurs 13 times, twice for הקשה (73 1315) and all the others for the root חזק either Qal or Hiphil (421 722 819 912 35 1020 27 1110 144 8 17). On the other hand, *βαρύνω* occurs six times (59 815 32 97 34 101) and always for the Qal or the Hiphil of כבד (which incidentally constitute all the instances in Exodus); i.e. the translator always and only used *βαρύνω* for כבד Qal or Hiphil.

106 Αἰγύπτου] των αιγυπτιων B 82 56-129-664 x 120 = Ra

The Ra text is not original. The word γῆ (in any case) is never modified by *των αιγυπτιων*, but always by *Αἰγύπτῳ* or *Αἰγύπτου*. The phrase "land of Egypt" (presupposing a Hebrew מִצְרַיִם (אֶרֶץ) occurs 62 times in Exod. On the other hand, (τῶν) Αἰγυπτίων (or in other cases) does occur frequently for מִצְרַיִם where the Masoretic vocalization designates "Egypt" rather than "(the) Egyptians."

1015 οὐχ ὑπελείφθη] ουκ απελ. 376-707 78* 85'; ου κατελ. (cvar) A M 58-426-οΓ^{-64ms} 82' C^{"-78*} (126) b d 246 n 30'-343' t γ⁻³¹⁸ 68' 18 55 59 76' 509 646

℞ has נותר. In the preceding clause הותר הברד was interpreted by *ὑπελείφθη ἀπὸ τῆς χαλάζης*, i.e. redrafted as a passive construction. Since the *κατα-* and the *υπο-*

compound both mean "to leave behind," it must be decided whether the translator would have changed to a *κατα*- compound or have been consistent in keeping the same form. There seems to be no compelling reason not to adopt the reading of B as the oldest witness.

1018 (ἡύξατο πρὸς) τὸν θεόν B 707 *b* f⁻²⁴⁶ n⁻⁴⁵⁸ x 392-527 120-128' 130 799 Arm Sa] pr $\overline{\alpha\nu}$ 82 246 458; om τὸν 708; $\overline{\alpha\nu}$ $\overline{\theta\nu}$ 64^{m8}; $\overline{\alpha\nu}$ rell = $\overline{\alpha\nu}$

In the story of the recurring dialogue between Moses and Pharaoh, prayer to Israel's God on behalf of Pharaoh is referred to on occasion. In Pharaoh's mouth it is always *εὐχασθε . . . πρὸς κύριον* (8⁸ 28 9²⁸); in 8⁸ 9²⁸ the translation correctly renders $\overline{\alpha\nu}$, and in 8²⁸ *πρὸς κύριον* has no equivalent in $\overline{\alpha\nu}$. When reference is made to Moses' prayer (8²⁹ 30 10¹⁸), $\overline{\alpha\nu}$ always has יהוה אל, but Exod has *πρὸς τὸν θεόν* each time. This may well represent an attempt to differentiate between Pharaoh who as heathen king dares to name Israel's God, whereas when Moses states his intention (8²⁹) or is said to pray on Pharaoh's behalf, only τὸν θεόν is used. This seems to be intentional on the translator's part, and does not suggest a different parent text.

1413 θεοῦ A B 135 551 s 121] κυρίου rell = $\overline{\alpha\nu}$

One might well be tempted to take the variant seriously except that the full nominal phrase is *παρὰ τοῦ θεοῦ*, with only 82-426-708 C 246 458 omitting the article. In fact, *τοῦ κυρίου* occurs only twice in Exod as opposed to the frequent *κυρίου* (53 times). In both cases $\overline{\alpha\nu}$ has ליהוה (8²⁹ 32⁵), i.e. the article is intended by the translator as a representation of the preposition.

For *κύριος* representing the tetragrammaton in the dative, i.e. usually for ליהוה, the unarticulated *κυρίῳ* occurs 41 times, whereas the articulated noun occurs 11 times. These articulated nouns all represent ליהוה (12⁴² 13¹² twice 15 15¹ 21 16²³ 25 30¹² 31¹⁵) except 24¹ where יהוה אל occurs.

The accusative occurs 25 times of which three have the article. At 14³¹ τὸν κύριον stands for יהוה את, but the other two are exceptions. At 5² Pharaoh says οὐκ οἶδα τὸν κύριον, and at 9³⁰ Moses says: I know that you still have not feared τὸν κύριον (56* omits τόν), whereas $\overline{\alpha\nu}$ has יהוה אלהים.

In the nominative *κύριος* occurs 235 times of which 11 refer to a human master. Of the 224 referring to God only six are articulated. Three of these occur in the expression *ὁ γὰρ κύριος* (14²⁵ 16²⁹ 34¹⁴), one (34⁹) as *ὁ κύριός μου* renders not the tetragrammaton but אדני; another (8²²) *ὁ κύριος πάσης τῆς γῆς* is a free rendering of בקרב הארץ as an attribute of יהוה, i.e. it is not an equivalent for the tetragrammaton. A final instance obtains at 9²⁷ in the nominal clause *ὁ κύριος δίκαιος*; the article here has the grammatical function of distinguishing the subject from the predicate.

In general it may be said that except for occasionally designating the preposition *ἐν* the translator almost always avoids using the article in the rendering of יהוה by *κύριος*. Accordingly *τοῦ θεοῦ* must be original at 14¹³.

125 ἀμυνῶν] ἀρῶν B 707 f⁻²⁴⁶ 392-527 76' 130 799 = Ra

The word *ἄρῶν* occurs in Exod only at 23¹⁹ 34²⁶ in the context of boiling an ἄρ-

νον in its mother's milk, where it renders the Hebrew גדי. On the other hand, ἀμνός is used by Exod to render כבש, which is always rendered by ἀμνός in Exod. Outside this passage כבש/αμνος occur five times in 29₃₈—41. Since ἀμνόν is strongly supported here, it seems reasonable to adopt it as consonant with Exod usage. Cf also Thack 152, n. 2.

1222 καὶ θίξετε (cvar) 376 126 b 527 799] om καί 15; θιξετε 72; θειξεσθε (cvar) 127 628; καθιξετε 30; καθιξετε (cvar) f⁻¹²⁹; καθιξεσθε (-θαι 75) 75'; καθιξεητε 730; καθεξετε 85 55; καθεξεσθε 646; καθιξεσθε (-θαι M) M^{ms} 426 321^{ms}; καθηξατε 16; καταθηξατε (και θηξ.*) 708; καθιξετε rell = Ra

Ra in spite of strong support can hardly be correct. Presumably καθιξετε would be derived from a verb καθιγειν (which LS does not recognize) or it would be a Doric future of καθιζειν which would be most unexpected. Nor would the latter verb be modified by a genitive as here (τῆς φλιᾶς). It is clearly an early corruption of καὶ θίξετε which is an excellent rendering of תִּהְיֶה of מ. Furthermore θιγγανω normally governs the genitive as well. When one examines the textual history with its many variants, one realizes the difficulties which scribes had with a text which had early been corrupted from ΚΑΙΘΙΞΕΤΕ to ΚΑΘΙΞΕΤΕ. Only an original καὶ θίξετε could explain the varied character of the tradition. Even more attractive (if there were only more than just ms 15 supporting it) would be θιξετε, i.e. without a και, were it not for the difficulty of explaining the intrusive κα(ι).

1239 ἐπιμεῖναι B F^b 15'-58-426 19' n] υπομειναι rell

On the whole, the ἐπι- compound fits the context rather better than the popular reading, though either is possible. If ἐπιμεῖναι be original (it occurs only here in all of LXX literature), the popular variant is easily explicable, since it is a common compound in the LXX. The reverse would be much more difficult to explain. Accordingly the lectio difficilior of B+ has been taken as original text.

1240 κατοίκησις] παροικησις (cvar) A F M^{txt} oI'-15 C'' d 246 s^{-85'ms} t x 121-392 z⁻¹²⁰ 18 55 59 76' 130 509 799

— κατόκησαν] παρωκ. A M^{txt} oI'-15 C''-500* d 246 s t 619 121-392 z⁻¹²⁰ 18 55 59 76' 130 509 799; παρωκησιν F; παρωκησεν 500*

מ has מושב and ישוב respectively. If one examines LXX usage, and more particularly Pentateuchal usage, it is clear that the κατ- compounds are to be preferred. The verb is very common in the Pentateuch and almost always occurs for ישוב (in Exod also at 215 1514 15). The noun occurs elsewhere in the Pentateuch only at Gen 10₃₀ 27₃₉ and Num 15₂ and always for מושב.

The verb παροικέω is much less frequent, occurring for ישוב in the Pentateuch only at Gen 24₃₇ and Num 20₁₅. It occurs for גור or מגור fairly often, 13 times in Gen, twice in Exod (64) and twice in Deut (186 265). Clearly Ra was right in adopting the κατ- compound in both instances, as well as at 215.

1312 ἀφελείς B M^{ms} 707 n 343-344^{txt} 392] pr αφοριεις και 85'; χωρισεις F^b; αφοριεις (-ρισεις x) rell

Ⲙ has והעביר, and probably means “and you shall set apart.” Either ἀφαιρέω or ἀφορίζω would serve as an adequate rendering for העביר. The former has been chosen as Exod because ἀφορίζω is never used elsewhere in the LXX to render העביר, whereas ἀφαιρέω has been. In fact, it is used as a common translation in a large number of contexts as the 35 Hebrew equations in HR show. In contrast, ἀφορίζω is used in Exod either as a cultic designation (for הניף) or for הגדיל in ch. 19.

157 ὥς A B F M 15'-64-707 30-321-344 121 76' 509] ὠσει rell

The word ὠσεί is used only as a particle of comparison in Exod and is always followed by a noun or its substitute. The particle ὥς is used in the same sense in Exod occasionally (119 1631 twice 1918 3632), though its use as a conjunction introducing a subordinate clause is more common. It is accordingly difficult to decide in the case of 157. Since ὠσεί occurs in vv. 5, 8 and 10, it seems likely that the popular reading ὠσει is ex par and not original. Furthermore all the uncials support ὥς and it seems wise to adopt it as critical text.

1623 ἕως] pr εἰς το 318; εἰς το B 82 f 85 527 120 130 799 = Ra; το 68'

1624 ἕως] εἰς το B M 82 f⁽⁻⁵³⁾ n 30'-85-321^{txt}-344^{txt} 318 18 46 Arm = Ra; + το (τω 120) 120-128'-628

One would expect עד בקר to be rendered by ἕως πρωί and לבקר by εἰς τὸ πρωί, and such is the case at 1210 twice 22 2318 2721 2934 over against 34225 respectively. In ch. 16 the situation is not too clear. The phrase עד בקר occurs four times (vv. 19 20 23 24). In v. 19 εἰς τὸ πρωί obtains in all witnesses except ms 426 and Cyr VI 512 which have the literal εως πρωι, whereas in v. 20 all witnesses have εἰς τὸ πρωί.

In the other two occurrences which are detailed above most witnesses have ἕως πρωί, but in both cases our oldest witness has εἰς το πρωι. I suspect the B readings to be secondary, since it is much easier to imagine a scribe changing ἕως to εἰς το having just written it twice than to imagine a partial correction towards the Hebrew text. It is, of course, possible that a different parent text obtained as well.

176 πρό — ἐλθεῖν] προ του ελθειν σε 125; προ του εισελθειν 246; προ του σε B 392 120 Arab Arm Co; προς σου 118'-537; προς σε 707; προ του σε εκει ελθειν 376^c; προ του εκεισε σε ελθειν 68'; προ του σε εκει (ηκειν 58) M Oⁿ⁻⁷² 376 707 127 343' 121^{txt}-318 18 46 55 59 76' 509 = Ra Ⲙ; + εκει 376* Cⁿ n⁻¹²⁷ s^{-343'} 121^{ms} 628; > 72 Aeth

The text chosen by Ra can hardly be correct. It is impossible Greek — note προ του σε —, nor is it any better in B which does have εκει first as Ⲙ. The problem the translator faced lies in the Hebrew הנני עמד לפניך שם על הצור. That God, who is speaking, should stand before Moses caused the difficulty, since it might imply God's subservience to Moses. So instead of שם the translator introduced ἐλθεῖν. Now the text gave no difficulty, since God now says “Here I stand, before you come on the rock.”

The problem in the tradition was twofold. First of all, ἐλθεῖν has no correspondent in the Hebrew, and secondly שם has no equivalent in the Greek. The reading adopted by Ra could be hex, it being supported by Oⁿ⁻⁷² 376 707, also in part by B+ with the corrected word order. But this is bad Greek. Another “correction” was to

add *εκει*, either at the beginning, which would be hex, or at the end. It is only when the tradition substituted *εκει* for *ἐλθεῖν* that an impossible Greek arose in the tradition.

1814 *πρωί*] *πρωθεν* (*προιθ.* M) B F M 82' *b* n⁻⁷⁵ x 392 z 18 76' 509 = Ra

The word occurs in the phrase *ἀπὸ πρωὶ ἕως δειλῆς*, which renders מִן בֹּקֶר עַד עֶרֶב. This phrase also occurs in v. 13 where Exod has *ἀπὸ πρωίθεν ἕως ἑσπέρας*. There B uniquely has *δειλῆς* for *ἑσπέρας*. In other words, B has levelled the two phrases by reading *απο πρωθεν εως δειλῆς* in both places. At v. 13 *πρωι* is read for *πρωίθεν* by O-15 25-52'-126-313'-550' 19 125 53' n⁻¹²⁷ 55 and 646', and in v. 14 *εσπερας* is read for *δειλῆς* by F 72-426-707 57^{ms} 53' 85'^{ms}-130^{ms} 318' 646 and Syh^{LXXIT}.

It would seem reasonable to assume that the translator either used different words to represent the two words for the idiom or exactly the same in both places. What seems determinative here is the logic of scribal process. Scribes were not revisers but rather copyists, and on the whole did their work remarkably well. That scribes would vary an idiom for the sake of variation is quite unlikely; on the other hand, the influence of a similar phrase in the context often led to variant readings. It is far more likely that the different renderings of the idiom came from the translator himself. This is made the more likely through the small support in the tradition for exactly the same readings in the two verses.

2312 *ἀναπαύσῃ*] *αναπανσις* B 82 30'-85-343' = Ra; cf also -σεις 120'

℞ has תַּשְׁבַּת, and there is no good reason for the translator to render it by a noun. On the other hand, that in the seventh day there is rest is found in 3115 *σάββατα ἀνάπανσις*, or at 352 *κατάπανσις*; the source of the variant is probably 3115. Note also how weakly supported the variant text is; outside of B only 82 and five s mss support the variant. The translator translated the verb literally and well, whereas the B text is secondary. Cf also Walters 320, note 4.

2313 *εἶρηκα*] *ειπον* 960 = ℞; *ελαλησα* C⁽⁻⁷⁷⁾-126 44 646; *λελαληκα* A F M O'-767-15-29 cI⁻¹²⁶ d⁻⁴⁴ s t z 18 46 55 59 76' 424 426 509 Aeth Syh^{ms}

℞ has אִמְרָתִי. The root אָמַר (disregarding לֵאמֹר) occurs 247 times in Exodus. Only twice is it omitted, four are rendered in an unusual way, i.e. by *θέλω*, *ἐρωτάω*, *ἐγκαλέω* and *ἀναγγέλω*. One case obtains with *φημί*, whereas 239 are rendered by *λέγω*/*εἶπω*/*εἶρω*, and only one, 3112, by *λαλέω*. This last-named occurs in the clause "And Yahweh said to Moses saying," and it should hardly surprise anyone that the pattern "And the Lord spoke to Moses saying" should obtain; either the parent text had וַיִּדְבֵּר or the translator was influenced ex par. That Ra was correct in choosing *εἶρηκα* rather than the popular *λελαληκα* is fully borne out by the translation pattern of Exod.

2318 *θυσιάσματός*] *θυμιαματος* (*θυμιασμ.* 130^c 84 68') A^c B C⁻⁴²² 19' f⁻²⁴⁶ 30'-130 84 x 68' 646'

3415 *θυσιῶν*] *θυματων* B O'-29 767 71' 55 426 = Ra

3425 *θυσιασμάτων*] *θυμιαματων* B 55* 426 = Ra

The readings of 23¹⁸ and 34²⁵ occur in identical environments between *αἷμα* and *μου*; in both cases *℣* has דם זבח. The word זבח is twice rendered by *θῦμα* (29²⁸ 34^{25-2°}), and everywhere else in Exod by *θυσία* (10²⁵ 12²⁷ 18¹² 24⁵ 34¹⁵). *θυμίαμα* is not a particularly appropriate rendering in this context, since its basic notion is that of incense and in Exod is the normal rendering for קמרת (30^{17 8 9 27 35 37} 31¹¹ 39¹⁶ 40²⁵). It is occasionally used for זבח, more or less as a general word for sacrifice, but *θυσίασμα* is obviously much better.

One is rather puzzled by Ra who normally followed the text of B closely. At 34²⁵ he does follow B, although the reading is supported by only two other witnesses. At 23¹⁸ he supported *θυσιάσματός* against both A^c and B which were supported by about one-third of all Greek mss. At 34¹⁵ the strong O support is rather odd. The variant is, however, poorly supported, probably since eating of *θυσιῶν* seems much more appropriate than of *θυμάτων*.

249 *τῆς γερουσίας* B O-^{376-82'} 129 *n x y*-³¹⁸ 128'-407-628 55 426] *των πρεσβυτερων* (+ *γερουσίας* 131^c) *rell*

℣ has מוקני which gives no help in establishing the critical text. זקנים occurs ten times in Exodus, of which five are rendered by *πρεσβύτεροι* (17⁵ 18¹² 19⁷ 24¹⁴), four, by *γερουσία* (3¹⁶ 4²⁹ 12²¹ 24⁹) and one (17⁶) by *νιοί* which probably presupposes בני. Here *τῆς γερουσίας* is probably to be preferred since vv. 1 and 14 both have *πρεσβύτεροι*; it would be much easier to explain *των πρεσβυτερων* as a scribal change produced under the influence of the context (in fact, v. 1 has exactly the same immediate context) than to understand *τῆς γερουσίας* as a variant of an originally consistent *των πρεσβυτερων* tradition.

2611 *συνάξεις* 107'-125] *συναψεις* *rell* = Ra

The verb *חבר* occurs once in v. 9, twice in v. 10 and once in v. 11; in three of these cases the verb *συνάπτω* is used, and once it is nominalized as *συμβολή*. The verb deals with the tying together of the curtains for the tent and detailed instructions about the loops and the links which each of the 11 curtains is to have. V. 11 specifically enjoins making of 50 bronze hooks or clasps (*κρίκους* for קרסי), and the bringing in of these clasps into the loops (the verb is *הבאת*). This is quite properly rendered by *συνάξεις*, not by *συναψεις*. Only then "shall you tie together the curtains" (the verb is *συνάψεις* for חברת), "and it (the tent) will be one." It is easy to see how the tradition misread an original *συνάξεις* as *συναψεις*. The words look alike; *συνάψεις* occurs in the context; *συναψεις* makes good sense, only it is not original text as *℣* conclusively shows.

2711 *ἀπληιώτην* B M^{ms} 767 56^{1xt} *n* 392 55] *απληιωτη* 19'; *αφηλιωτην* 707 527; *pr* *προς βορραν* *f*-56^{1xt}; *νοτον* 29; *βορραν* *rell* = *℣*

The translator has turned the tabernacle of *℣* around by ninety degrees. In *℣* the long sides (hangings a hundred cubits long) are respectively south (נגב תימנה — v. 9) and north (צפון — v. 11). The broad sides (with hangings fifty cubits long) are west (ים in v. 12), and east (קדמה מזרחה — v. 13). The first pair, i.e. the long sides, are

rendered by *λίβα* and *ἀπηλιώτην* resp. Here the pair means “west” and “east” resp. (not southwest and northeast as some would have it); this usage is attested as early as the second century B.C. in the papyri; cf LS sub *λίψ*; *ἀπηλιώτη* simply means “east” (usually of wind but not necessarily). Then the broad sides are rendered by *τὸ κατὰ θάλασσαν* (understood as north) and *τὸ πρὸς νότον* resp. The reason for the Alexandrian translator’s change of orientation is probably rooted in the meaning of the word *מ* which in Alexandria is not “west” but “north.” Once this is understood the other directions fall into place. It should be noted that this is only the case when all four directions are detailed. At 26^{18–22} *מ* is correctly understood to be “west.” The tradition has, of course, tried to “correct” these directions as above in v. 11. Note also

v. 9 *λίβα*] sup ras A; *νοτον* F M^{txt} O⁷⁶⁷-15-29 C^{73 313*} 118’-537 106^c 246 s⁻³⁰ z⁻¹²⁰
18 46 59 76’ 426 509 Arab Arm(vid) Bo = *ℳ*; *νωτον* 82 73-313* 30 120
v. 13 *νότον* B^(mg) M^{mg} 767^(mg) *d f n t* 392 55 799 L^{at}cod 100] + *ανατολας* 318; *ανατολας*
rell = *ℳ*

In the corrected tradition *τὸ κατὰ θάλασσαν* was quite naturally understood as meaning “west,” and therefore not needing correction.

The word *λίβα* occurs only twice in Exod, the other passage occurring in the parallel passage in 37⁷. This records the actual construction of the courtyard, but this time the orientation is no longer Alexandrian. The Hebrew directions (38^{9–13}) are exactly as they were in 27^{9–13}, but the translator has the directions ordered as *λίβα*, *βορρᾶν*, *θάλασσαν* and *ἀνατολάς*, i.e. *λίβα* now means “south,” and *θάλασσαν* means “west.”

28³⁹ *ὅταν 1°*] *ὡς αν* B 82-376 129 127 85’^{txt}-130^{txt}-343’ 71’ 55 = Ra; *εως αν* O⁻³⁷⁶; *εις αν* n⁻¹²⁷

This occurs in the context of *ὅταν εἰσπορεύονται* for the Hebrew *בבאם*, i.e. the preposition *ב* with a bound infinitive and a pronominal suffix, which is commonly rendered by some kind of temporal clause.

The translation pattern found in Exod is determinative in choosing *ὅταν* rather than *ὡς αν* as critical text. The latter occurs only twice in Exod; in 9²⁹ *ὡς ἂν ἐξέλθω* renders *כצאתי* of *ℳ*, and at 13¹¹ *ὡς ἂν εἰσαγάγῃ σε* is the translation of *כי יבאך*.

The evidence for *ὅταν* in Exod is as follows. In each case the Hebrew text is also cited when it obtains.

116 *ὅταν μαιεύσθε* — *בילדכן*
321 *ὅταν δὲ ἀποτρέχητε* — *כי תלכו*
111 *ὅταν δὲ ἐξαποστέλλῃ* — *כשלחו*
1213 *ὅταν παύω* — *בהכתי*
1816 *ὅταν γὰρ γένηται* — *כי יהיה*
1913 *ὅταν . . . ἀπέλθῃ* — *במשך*
2318 *ὅταν γὰρ ἐβάλω* — no equivalent in *ℳ*
2826 *ὅταν εἰσπορεύηται* — *בבאו*
2839 *ὅταν προσπορεύονται* — *בגשתם*
307 *ὅταν ἐπισκευάξῃ* — *בהיטיבו*
308 *ὅταν ἐξάπτη* — *בהעלת*
3020 *ὅταν εἰσπορεύονται* — *בבאם*
3020 *ὅταν προσπορεύονται* — *בגשתם*
3424 *ὅταν γὰρ ἐβάλω* — *כי אוריש*
3827 *ὅταν προσπορεύονται* — *בקרבתם*

It will be noted that the *ὅταν* clauses mainly represent the preposition ב plus a bound infinitive with pronominal suffix. In no case is such a construction rendered by *ὡς αν*. Furthermore 30²⁰ is a close parallel to 28³⁹, both having *ὅταν εἰσπορεύονται . . . ἢ ὅταν προσπορεύονται*. The conclusion that *ὅταν* 1° is original in 28³⁹ seems inescapable. Surprisingly, *ἐν τῷ* plus infinitive as a rendering for the ב pattern occurs only six times in Exod (3¹² 16⁷ 8 27⁷ 29³⁶ 34²⁹); it also occurs twice for ל with infinitive (28³¹ 30¹⁵).

29²⁸ ἀφαίρεμα 1°] ἀφορισμα B O⁻³⁷⁶-82 71' 55
— ἀφαίρεμα 2° A B 58-82 129 71' 121 55] ἀφορισμα rel

The word *ἀφαίρεμα* is reserved for rendering תרומה throughout this chapter (also vv. 27 28 ter), whereas *ἀφορισμα* occurs only for תנופה (vv. 24 26 27). The latter word also occurs at 36³⁸ where Exod has *ἀφόρισμα τοῦ ἁγίου* for נזר הקדש. Presumably *ἄ* (39³⁰) is there misunderstood as a dedicatory offering of the sanctuary instead of a holy diadem. The same phrase occurs in 29⁶ where it is rendered by τὸ πέταλον τὸ ἁγίασμα. The equation *ἀφαίρεμα* / תרומה also occurs at 35⁵ 21 24 twice and 36³. In the last section of the book it does, however, also occur for תנופה at 35²² and 39⁷ (and for נדבה at 35²⁹, and without Hebrew counterpart at 39² 12). It should be pointed out that only in the last part of Exod does the confusion of תנופה/תרומה as = ἀφαίρεμα obtain. In ch. 29 the distinction is rigidly upheld.

30⁶ ἐκεῖθεν B oII⁻²⁹ d f n t 527 126-128'-628 55 426 799 Latcod 100] ἐκεῖ rel

The word occurs only four times in Exod and always in the context *γνωσθήσομαι σοι ἐκεῖθεν*. In fact, *ἄ* does have שמה here, as well as at 29⁴² 30³⁶, though at 25²¹ it has ש. These also are the only instances of *γνωσθήσομαι σοι* in Exod. Only at 29⁴² is there any possible doubt about the text since *ἐκεῖθεν* is supported only by A^c B 15' f 30'-130^{ms}-321^{ms} 392 128'-628 55 646', all others having *ἐκεῖ*. In the other two instances all Greek mss have *ἐκεῖθεν*.

In fact, שמה as well as ש is often rendered by *ἐκεῖ* (five times for שמה, and 13 times for ש), whereas twice *εἰς αὐτόν* is used for שמה (16³³ 30¹⁸). The translator reserved *ἐκεῖθεν* solely for the idiom "I will be known to you there."

31¹⁵ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ 2°] του σαββατου A F^b M O⁻⁷⁶⁷-29-64'-707¹ 44' t 527 121' 18 46 319 509
Latcod 104 Aeth Arab Arm Bo Syh = *ἄ*; των σαββατων 707-767 C" b n s 59 646 Latcod 100

ἄ has השבת. The phrase *τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἐβδόμῃ* occurs earlier in the verse in the context of being the sabbath (σάββατα). The translator then in the context of sabbath conditions repeats "on the seventh day" rather than *ἄ*'s "on the Sabbath day." In any event the A+ reading is clearly not Exod, since Exod uses only the plural word to designate the Sabbath. On the other hand, the pattern of support for the plural makes that reading unlikely as original text; it is, however, much more common with "day" than the singular (e.g. 20⁸ 35³ as well as elsewhere in the Pentateuch). The singular reading seems to be a hex correction; the plural is ex par.

3313 *εἶδω* F 707 106 129 318 509 799 Arab] *εἶδως* 82-767; *εἶδον* (ιδ. 53) 53'; *ἰδοιμι* (*ιδωμε**) 426; *et noscam et videam* Aeth; *ut noscam* Arm; *ιδω* rell = Ra

Walters (199f) is certainly correct in insisting that *εἶδω* is the correct spelling of the original text, since the Hebrew has וִיֵּדַע, and not the verb יָדָה which the itacistic *ιδω* variant would presuppose. When the variant *ιδ-* vs. *ειδ-* is at stake the Hebrew is usually decisive. It is, however, not automatic since in some contexts “to see” and “to know” are both possible interpretations. Here *εἶδω* can only represent the subjunctive of *οἶδα*, whereas *ιδω* can only be the aorist subjunctive of *ὁράω*, and the former alone can correctly render אֵדַע.

343 *μηδέ* (*μηδ* 126) B 767-oII⁻²⁹ f n x⁻⁵⁰⁹ 392 126-128'-407-628 55 426 799 L^acodd 100 103 Sa] *η* 125; *και μηδεις* rell = *ᾤ*

The translator had rendered וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵעָלֶה by *καὶ μηδεις ἀναβήτω*, but for the parallel יֵרָא אֵל יְיָ he does not use the repetitive *και μηδεις* but the much more idiomatic *μηδέ* by which the *μηδεις* of the first clause automatically does duty as subject of *ὀφθῆτω* as well. The widespread variant is then a hebraizing correction, possibly already prehexaplaric in origin, and is a literalism later than Exod.

344 *καθότι* B 82' 129 71' 55] *καθαπερ* 767 414* n; *καθα* rell

The three adverbs involved are barely distinguishable in usage in Exod, each being used to render a כֹּאשֶׁר with the same lexical intent. Of the three *καθότι* only occurs five times elsewhere (112 17 1010 1225 2122) with little variation in the tradition. *Καθά* occurs 14 times of which nine are for כֹּאשֶׁר clauses (as well as כ, אֲשֶׁר, כ, ככל אֲשֶׁר), whereas *καθάπερ* occurs 21 times of which 15 cases represent כֹּאשֶׁר. Since there is no other good basis for choice, it would seem safest to follow the oldest witness in each case as Ra has done. The only other instance which might be queried, i.e. an instance where the lemma is not supported by the majority of the Greek witnesses, is at 4025: *καθάπερ* B O-82' 19' 129 54 68'-120'-630 426 Syh] *κα* 344^{m8}; *καθα* 15 118'-537 n⁻⁵⁴ 527 126 55; *ον τροπον* rell.

Here too it is a כֹּאשֶׁר clause which is involved, and the reading of B has been adopted as critical text.

3426 *εἰσοίσεις*] *θησεις* B 15 129^{ix} 318 Sa = Ra
— *οὐχ ἐψησεις*] *ου προσοισεις* B 15 = Ra

Neither of the variant verbs remotely approximates the Hebrew text. The first one refers to “the first fruits of thy land *εἰσοίσεις* into the house of the Lord,” for which *ᾤ* has תָּבִיא. The second is found in the proverbial לֹא תִבְשַׁל “you shall not boil” a kid in its mother’s milk, which also occurs at 2319 in exactly the same form.

It is, however, difficult to understand how such odd variants should arise from such straightforward renderings as Exod has. One possibility which might explain the rise of these readings is that they are based on an earlier transposition of the two verbs. Then since *ἐψησεις* made no sense in the first clause it was “fixed up” by a word which looked something like it, becoming *θησεις*. With *εἰσοίσεις* in the second clause a change to *προσοισεις* would be a logical though false “correction.”

In any event the readings of B+ can hardly be original. The verb *τίθημι* never translates *הביא* in the LXX, nor does *προσφέρω* equal *בשל*. They should certainly not be considered for the critical text in any serious fashion.

3429 καὶ (αἱ δύο πλάκες) B O²⁹ b 129* (cpr m) n 527 120' -126 55 426 ^{Lat}cod 100 Arab Arm Sa Syh] + *ιδου* rell | om *αἱ δ τ* 318 | om *δυσ* A F M' 29 C'' s γ⁻³¹⁸ 68' 18 46 59 319 509

ℳ has *לחתי שני*, and there is no doubt that *αἱ δύο πλάκες* is Exod. Actually, the variant readings are easily explained palaeographically on the basis of Exod. The word *δύο* was misread as *ιδου* producing both an *ιδου αι* text and an *ιδου* text. The mss which have both *ιδου* and *δύο* have a palaeographic doublet. It should be noted that *δύο* alone, i.e. not *ιδου*, has support in ℳ.

3429 (τοῦ) *χρωτός*] *χρωματος* B 72 56 799 Arm = Ra
3430 (τοῦ) *χρωτός*] *χρωματος* B 72 Aeth^{-P} Arm = Ra

In both instances the context is *ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρωτός τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ* and refers to the appearance of Moses' skin. The Hebrew word is *עור פניו* and *עור פניו* refers to the skin of his face. The word *χρῶμα* means "color," thus "complexion." The use of *χρῶμα* in the sense of "skin" is dubious; cf LS. The variant text is an attempt to smooth out the text; the expression *χρωτός τοῦ προσώπου* is, however, an exact rendering of the Hebrew and is to be preferred.

3430 *πρεσβύτεροι* B M^{m8} 15' f 344^{m8} 318 120' 55 Sa] *υιοι* rell = ℳ

Though ℳ has *בני* the rendering *οἱ πρεσβύτεροι* is Exod. The verse refers to those who saw Moses with his shining countenance and were afraid to approach him. The following verse explained that Moses had called them, and *Ἀαρὼν καὶ πάντες οἱ ἄρχοντες τῆς συναγωγῆς* had responded. It was only subsequent to that that all *οἱ υἱοὶ Ἰσραὴλ* came to him. So Exod rationalized the identity of *בני ישראל* of v.30 as really being only the *πρεσβύτεροι*, i.e. the leaders of the assembly. The popular variant *υιοι* is then an early correction based on the Hebrew, probably prehexaplaric in nature.

352 *κατάπανσις* B F 836 82 b^{-118*} f⁻⁵⁶ 127 730 527 392 426 ^{Lat}cod 100 Aeth^{-CPR} Bo Syh] *requiescitis* Aeth^C; *-σεις* (-σης 376 30) rell

It is unlikely that the verb of the majority reading is anything more than an itacism. The origin of the translation is puzzling since it has no basis in ℳ which has *יהיה לכם*. The translator has disregarded the text and added another to the list (*κατάπανσις*) *ἅγιον, σάββατα, ἀνάπανσις*. The attitude towards the parent text contrasts sharply with that seen in 3115. Incidentally, the word *κατάπανσις* does not occur elsewhere in Exod.

359 *διανοίᾳ*] *καρδια* B O²⁹ f⁻¹²⁹ n 392 68' -120' 55 799 = Ra

Though either *διανοια* or *καρδια* could stand as a rendering for the Hebrew *לב*, it is the former that is favored in chh. 35 and 36. In fact, *καρδια* occurs only in 35s 21 362, whereas *διάνοια* occurs at 35s 22 25 26 29 34 35 361. In the first 34 chh. *καρδια* is favored, though this is not really meaningful, since in chh. 4—14 references to the

hardening of Pharaoh's heart, all with *καρδία*, are numerous. Outside of these references *καρδία* occurs only in 25² 31⁶ whereas *διάνοια* occurs in 9²¹ 28³.

In view of the obvious preference which the translator of ch. 35 had for *διανοία* this would seem to be a wise choice for critical text in v. 9. It should be added that versional evidence (except for Syh which supports *διανοία*) is irrelevant since the versions do not generally make a distinction between the two Greek words.

35²³ *παρ'*] *πας* A F M' oI-29-82 C'' b s 71' 121' 126-128'-628 18 46 59 319 509 Lat^{codd} 100 103 Aeth Arab Bo; *παντι d n t*; *πας* (✕ Arm^{mss} Syh) *ανηρ* O(-72) Arm Syh

The context reads *καὶ παρ' ᾧ εὐρέθη*, and at first blush the popular *πας* might well seem to be the original text and that *παρ'* was secondary, being palaeographically inspired. The context in *ℳ* is *וְכָל אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר נִמְצָא אֹתוֹ* and *כָּל אִישׁ* is much better represented by *πας* than by *παρ'*. But a number of the mss which have *πας* add *παρ αὐτω* after *εὐρέθη* as well which addition is obviously a hex plus (whereas many others add the prepositional phrase after *βύσσοις*).

Almost the same clause (with only *אִישׁ* lacking) occurs in *ℳ* of v. 24. There the phrase is understood to have a plural referent and it is translated by *καὶ παρ' οἷς εὐρέθη*. Only hex witnesses change the *παρ' οἷς*. Ms 376 has *πας ως*, 767 has *πας οἷς*, and 58-72 have *παντι οσοις*, and a popular variant, hex in origin, also adds *παρ αυτοις* after the verb. It is clear that *παρ'* in v. 23 must be original.

37²¹ *ποικιλτά*] *ποικιλτικα* B O-³⁷⁶ b 68'-120' = Ra

Since the two words look alike, a variant may easily arise through scribal carelessness. Both words make sense in the context, but *ποικιλτά* seems a better parallel to *ὕφαντά* and *ῥαφιδεντά* than *ποικιλτικα*. Furthermore *ποικιλτικα* is only sparsely supported, whereas *ποικιλτά* enjoys wide support. At 35³⁵ the word also occurs as a pair in the phrase *τὰ ὕφαντά καὶ τὰ ποικιλτά* with only mss 25*(vid) 426 799 witnessing to a variant *ποικιλτικα*. All things considered, it seems reasonable to take *ποικιλτά* here as Exod.

38¹⁶ *ἐνθέμια*] *ανθεμια* F^{avid} M^{mg} G-58-707(mg) C''(-552) 19' f-¹²⁹ 127* s 527 318 128 Phil III 49 Lat^{codd} 91 94-96 100

38¹⁶ *ἐνθέμιον*] *ανθεμιον* F^{avid} M^{mg} O-³⁷⁶-707 C'' 19' f-¹²⁹ s x 318 126^c-128'-628 426 799 Phil III 49 Lat^{codd} 91 94-96 100 104

Gr. proposed *ανθεμια* / *ανθεμιον* as original text and this in turn was endorsed by Wa (51), but this is fanciful. It is true that *ℳ* at 37^{19 20} refers inter alia to *פְּרָחִיָּה* but the Greek only vaguely has anything to do with the Hebrew. Exod simply describes the candelabrum in his own way. According to the Greek there were lampbowls which were almond-shaped, and protruding from the bowls were the *ἐνθέμια* on which were the lights. Obviously, they had to be some kind of container or socket for holding the *λύχνους*. A diminutive of *ἐνθεμα* from the root *ἐντίθημι* seems particularly fitting. The variant text has nothing to do with the Hebrew; it is simply a scribal error, influenced possibly by *καρυωτά* occurring in the preceding clause but there describing the *λαμπάδια*.

38²⁵ τῆς κρίσεως (χρεῖσ. B*) B 15'-376 129 x 68'-120' 55 426] του χρίσματος rell

Here one can only follow the oldest witness (B) since Exod rendered the bound phrase either by (τὸ ἔλαιον) τοῦ χρίσματος, χρίσμα, or τῆς κρίσεως. They occur as follows: τοῦ χρίσματος in 29⁷ 35^{14 19} 40⁷; χρίσμα twice in 30²⁵, and (τῆς) κρίσεως in 29²¹ 30³¹ 31¹¹ 35²⁸ 39¹⁶. When it is supplied sub ✕ (25⁵ 35⁷) it is τῆς κρίσεως. The translator showed no favoritism, using χρίσμα six times and κρίσις six times.

39²² παρασκευήν] κατασκευην F^b M' 707 C'' 118'-537 n s 126-128'-628 18 646; αποσκευην B 15 527 68'-120' 55 = Ra

ℳ has עבדה and the reference is to all the equipage connected with the tabernacle. It is difficult to decide between παρασκευήν and κατασκευην, since they mean about the same thing. The B+ reading is not a serious contender for Exod. It does occur at 27¹⁹ as the secondary reading in A 121 for κατασκευή (ℳ having כלי), but otherwise it occurs in Exod only for מן (10^{10 24} 12³⁷). The κατα- compound is an attractive possibility, since it does occur for עבדה at 35²⁴ (with only 68 Sixt reading παρασκευης), and at 36⁷ for מלאכה, whereas παρασκευή does not obtain elsewhere in Exod. This is of little significance since it is a well-known compound which would fit here just as well as κατασκευην. In the end, only the tradition can actually be decisive and the support for παρασκευήν is rather stronger than that of the variant (mainly C n s support) and the choice of παρασκευήν seems justified.

40⁶ τὴν αὐλήν] (cvar) τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ (αὐτῆς B pro ἐν α.) αγιασεις B M^{ms} 15-376-767 19' f x 68'-120' 55 799 Arm Syh

The above variants with almost identical support must be seen as part of a single picture. That σκηνην cannot be original is clear from the sense. The Hebrew reads סביב החצר ושמת את החצר סביב, and Exod has rendered this well by καὶ περιθήσεις τὴν αὐλήν κύκλῳ. The verb περιθήσεις was chosen because of סביב, and the clause means: and you shall place the courtyard around (i.e. the tent area). The remainder of the verse in ℳ has been omitted by Exod who abbreviates rather extensively throughout this chapter.

The secondary change to σκηνην as well as the gloss καὶ — αγιασεις is based on v.7; its second clause has a direct modifier of κρίσεις: τὴν σκηνὴν καὶ πάντα τὰ ἐν αὐτῇ (καὶ ἀγιάσεις). This makes perfectly good sense in the context of v.7, but here the variant is the result of copying the σκηνήν through ἀγιάσεις. The variant text creates an unintelligible statement; what can περιθήσεις τὴν σκηνην possibly intend?

Index

(Occurrences in large lists are not included)

11	233	9	149	26	183
7	224, 239	10	69, 235, 239,	27	58, 72, 152, 155,
9	105, 213		260		207
10	105, 111, 219	11	239, 240, 252	28	82, 150, 235
11	57, 69, 105, 108	12	72, 152, 173,	29	42, 244, 266
12	224, 239, 269		186, 207, 235,	31	148
13	224		240, 255, 268	51	196, 232, 242
14	57, 58, 213f,	13	235	2	96, 224f, 235,
	224	14	69, 72, 82, 235,		262
15	213		240	3	72, 240
16	147, 225, 267	15	154, 235	4	186, 188
17	106, 224, 269	16	46, 69, 154, 244,	5	252
18	224, 251		260, 266	7	206, 220, 260
19	213, 224, 232,	17	155, 157, 175,	8	72, 220, 240,
	264		232		259
20	224, 239	18	42, 240, 243,	9	95, 261
21	147, 224		244	10	42, 241f
22	149	20	182, 196	11	149, 259, 260
21	69	21	147, 267	14	58, 201, 206,
2	189, 219	22	82, 177, 187,		251
3	105, 169, 223		251, 258	15	185
4	189, 224	41	96, 168, 251	16	58, 164
5	105, 219, 235	3	253	17	59, 240
7	210	4	182, 183, 235,	18	260
8	105		251	19	42, 209
9	105, 111, 173	5	46, 154	20	152, 155
10	105, 169, 255	6	97, 110, 182,	21	169, 232
11	106, 167, 169		183	22	235, 258
12	259	7	46, 58, 182, 183	23	188, 235f
13	185, 258	8	108, 147, 228	61	69, 207, 218
14	111, 185	9	72, 147, 149	3	150f
15	59, 155, 234f,	10	109, 206, 240,	4	59, 155, 263
	263		252	5	149
16	148, 239f	11	95, 251f	6	207, 213, 255
18	86, 108, 239,	12	147, 149, 188,	7	58, 72, 175f, 226
	251		190	8	86, 150, 173,
19	185f, 232	13	235		182
20	213	14	82, 155, 164,	11	209f
21	96, 152		196, 252	12	147, 214, 240
22	106, 167, 240,	15	147, 149, 191	13	59, 72, 260
	255	16	72, 243	14—25	162
23	167, 174	18	69, 105, 152,	14	162
24	150f		174, 239, 258	15	69, 83, 95, 207
31	108, 224, 239	19	105, 243, 260	16	162
2	175, 211	20	69, 105, 187,	18	86, 162, 207f,
3	251		215, 258		208
4	106, 189, 241,	21	258, 261	20	86, 196, 203,
	255	23	57, 82, 111, 149,		208
6	154, 215, 240		173, 191, 232,	21	208
8	59, 147, 151,		242	22	96, 252
	155, 157, 175,	24	110, 167	23	59, 69, 72, 95,
	251	25	147, 183		162, 208, 242

26	46	17	58, 72, 154, 183,	25	154, 164, 201,
27	171, 260		197, 201, 213,		254
28f	167		214	26	58
28	95, 152, 201	18	59, 213, 214,	27	235
29	185		223	28	262
30	147, 214, 240	19	188, 213, 232,	29	57, 95, 148, 267
71	59, 243, 252,		253, 261	30	262
	255	20	164, 173, 191,	33	82, 86, 148
2	59, 188, 252		242	34	261
3	187, 201, 261	21	58, 59, 185, 198	35	152, 235, 261
4	72, 182	22	154, 155, 236,	101	59, 191, 255,
5	95, 182, 240,		240, 242, 253,		261
	252		262	2	58, 59, 97
6	174, 186, 253	23	168, 243	3	173, 232, 242
7	176, 220, 252	24	154f, 198, 246	4	183, 185
8	95	25	240, 255, 260	5	242
9	168, 252, 252f	26	83, 228f, 240	6	191, 254, 261
10	72, 174, 244,	27	228, 240	7	72, 162, 235,
	253	28	46, 72, 111, 235,		240
12	153f		240, 242, 251,	8	57, 164, 225,
13	188		262		240, 259, 260
14	260f	29	42, 58, 82, 195,	9	59, 97, 155, 187,
16	173, 235, 242		212, 262		258
17	185	30	234, 262	10	46, 235, 269,
18	72, 255	31	72, 212, 244,		272
19	57, 82, 95, 148,		253, 259	11	164, 218, 240,
	154, 182, 201,	32	261		260
	213, 226, 252,	91	173, 242	12	155, 217
	253	2	46, 191, 251,	13	166, 215, 253
20	46, 59, 174, 253		261	14	46, 59, 154,
21	57, 69, 154, 201,	3	94, 212, 213,		195f
	223, 255		214, 236	15	154, 201, 213,
22	72, 82, 94, 253,	4	42, 148, 164,		259, 261f
	261		176, 242	16	214, 225, 255
24	223, 255	6	148, 259	17	243
81	173, 242	7	42, 147, 219,	18	234, 262
2	183, 185		235, 242, 259,	19	82, 97, 144, 154,
3	69, 187, 213		261		161, 201, 206
4	217	8	194, 220, 255	20	261
5	95, 148, 182,	9	154f, 201, 214,	21	59, 155, 182
	252		226	22	154, 183
6	57, 59, 95, 148,	10	72, 213, 214,	23	58, 97, 243, 259
	155, 183		220	24	187, 225, 240,
7	95, 155	11	154, 201, 213,		255, 260, 272
8	72, 83, 95, 148,		223	25	46, 251, 266
	162, 173, 212,	12	253, 261	26	69, 82, 173, 240
	262	13	173, 242, 256	27	261
9	42, 148, 210,	14	185, 235, 254	28	72, 243, 258
	212	15	182, 235, 261	29	258
11	97, 187, 212,	16	83	111	69, 171, 196,
	215	17	97, 147		235, 267
13	58, 97, 215, 253	18	95, 185	2	177, 188
14	197	19	69, 83, 198	3	58, 69
15	46, 219, 253,	21	198	4	59, 185
	261	22	42, 154, 182	5	164, 201
16	154, 197, 201,	23	154	6	154
	213, 214, 226, 256	24	46	7	162

8	183, 186, 194, 196	45	168	28	165
9	201, 243	46	69, 148, 165	30	151
10	86, 95, 187, 201, 243, 261	47	153	31	72, 152, 262
12 ₁	201	48	58, 72	15 ₁	72, 94, 232, 255, 262
3	57, 153, 243	50	153, 174, 186, 253	2	35, 154, 226, 243
4	72, 106, 112, 191, 230	51	69, 167	4	161
5	109, 212, 262 f	13 ₂	95	5	264
6	153, 191, 220	3	207, 233, 238	6	207
7	149, 191	5	58, 149, 155, 157, 175	7	235, 264
8	211	7	72	8	264
9	72, 211, 251	8	174, 241	9	197 f, 224
10	95, 109, 148, 211, 230, 264	9	207, 241	10	264
11	69, 187, 201 f	11	147, 155, 173, 229, 241, 267	13	186
12	86, 151, 201	12	69, 149, 229, 254 f, 262, 263 f	14	223, 235, 263
13	97, 174, 201, 267	14	82, 196, 207, 239	15	235, 263
14	82, 160, 174, 243	15	185, 199, 201, 261, 262	17	83
15	224, 246	16	95, 207	19	35, 187
16	189, 230 f	17	154, 168, 191, 258	20	219, 233
17	159 f	18	144, 161, 206	21	94, 255, 262
18	206	19	69, 169, 241, 243	22	94, 161, 233, 255
19	213, 214, 246	20	72	23	83, 208, 224, 233, 255
20	167	22	82	24	86, 215
21	72, 194, 196, 243 f, 266	20	64, 69, 258	25	226
22	59, 96, 112, 263, 264	22	95, 213, 240, 261	26	240
23	246	4	95, 225 f, 232, 244	27	69, 97, 233, 234 151, 152, 153, 206, 233
25	42, 43, 174, 188, 225, 269	5	69	2	57, 153, 215
27	59, 266	6	219	3	58, 59, 106, 201, 232
28	153, 174, 186, 253	7	207, 244, 261	4	185
29	164, 166, 167, 201	8	187, 233	5	42, 149
30	69, 201, 219	9	42, 58, 106	6	153, 162
31	42, 43, 164, 225, 240, 260	10	64, 97, 201	7	97, 215, 268
32	187, 260	11	64, 173	8	57, 215, 251, 268
33	218, 232, 235	12	111, 195, 262	9	153, 213, 233
34	187	13	69, 185	10	153, 215
35	176 f, 253	15	69, 106, 182, 233, 253	12	163
37	219, 272	16	188, 261	13	162 f, 165, 167
39	95, 223, 231, 263	17	187, 213, 240	15	57, 86, 155, 189, 232
40	82, 201, 234, 263	18	244	16	42, 59, 216, 245
41	82, 97, 155, 167	19	57, 147, 244	18	42, 58, 196, 219
42	59, 159, 202, 262	20	183	19	169 f, 264
43	254, 255	21	233	20	72, 95, 169 f, 234, 251, 264
44	168, 203	22	187, 233	22	152, 167, 199, 207, 233
		23	166, 167, 215	23	82, 83, 95, 149, 188, 199, 249, 262, 264
		24	262	24	57, 97, 111, 234, 253, 264
		26	182, 187		
		27	42, 43, 183		

25	177, 200, 249, 262	26	158, 234	7	58
26	72, 200, 244	191	82, 151, 233	8	72, 149 f, 168
27	167, 233	2	82, 86, 151, 233	9	72, 189
29	42, 43, 46, 94, 97, 189, 200, 244 f, 262	3	217	10	187, 196
31	264	5f	246	11	189
33	58, 268	5	154, 226	12	177
34	86, 153	7	86, 95, 192, 266	13	59, 251
35	155, 233, 234	8	86, 97, 232	15	177
171	58, 152, 153, 167, 234	9	185	16	177
2	255	10	59, 95	17	149, 177
3	59, 187, 215, 245, 255	11	82, 152, 226	19	57, 69, 168
5	72, 86, 97, 266	12	58, 177, 217, 224	20	229
6	186, 255, 264 f, 266	13	58, 168, 217, 267	21	229
7	72, 201	15	57, 213	22	269
8	95	16	58, 82, 97, 151, 154, 165, 167, 226 f	23	229
9	209, 245	17	155	26	69, 72
10	217, 245	18	111, 152, 170, 264	27	187
11	183, 226, 253	19	188, 226	28	58
12	162	20	152	29	59
13	82, 197 f	21	72, 220, 255	30	95, 149
14	58, 83, 97, 208	22	95, 240, 241	31	177 f, 189
15	95, 106, 109	23	82, 152	32	178
16	207	24	59, 164, 183, 194, 249, 260	33	72
181	58, 59, 241	201	96, 188, 241	34	59
2	95	2	218 f, 240	35	82
3	245, 255	4	189	36	72, 206
4	245	5	58, 219	223	225
5	69, 187, 216, 236	8	199, 200, 268	4	72, 235
6	97, 152, 170, 187, 207, 255	10	183, 187, 200, 249	5	59, 72, 168
7	155, 191 f	11	42, 59, 234	7	82, 168
8	82, 148, 151	12	184, 187	8	58, 194, 215
9	96, 148, 151, 174	13—15	171	9	59, 94, 210, 215
10	151	17	187, 260	10	46, 170, 246
12	165, 266	18	155	11	173, 194, 229
13	82, 152, 167, 207, 265	19	232	12	97
14	57, 185, 251, 258, 265	20	258	13	229
15	258	21	59, 95	14	59, 69, 72, 246
16	185, 267	22	72	15	69, 72
18	42, 43, 58, 183, 185, 189	23	59, 189, 196	16	173, 196, 224
19	183, 194	24	69, 72, 111, 149, 188, 189	17	173
21	59, 245	25	95, 192	20	46, 246
22	224	26	217	21	201
23	42, 82, 168, 170, 177, 191	211	72	24	72, 197 f, 226
25	245	2—4	193	25	46
		2	168, 205	27	168, 240, 252
		3	170	28	57, 199
		4	193, 202	30	82, 95, 173, 206
		5	187	31	69
		6	147, 216 f	232	83
				4	259
				5	83, 97, 251
				7	72
				9	148, 201
				11	72, 82, 206
				12	265
				13	72, 265
				15	57, 197, 253

16	149, 202	17	59, 83	33	82, 174, 224
17	214	18	57	36	189
18	57, 58, 218, 237, 264, 265 f, 267	19	59, 223, 226	37	69, 122, 123, 136, 140, 158, 257
19	262, 269	21	111, 134, 237, 268	271	198, 202
20	185, 217, 218, 235	22	57, 82, 121, 187, 198, 202	3	111
21	46, 148, 246	23	121, 178, 189, 199, 257	4	82, 189
22	19, 246	24	178, 199, 257	5	137, 226
23	157, 175	25	82, 189	6	179, 202
24	72, 95, 251	26	58, 181	7	42, 57, 72, 226, 268
25	46, 72	28	59, 187	8	69, 186
27	57, 235	29	134	9	58, 146, 198, 266 f
28	59, 157, 217, 218, 235	30	134, 135, 187	10	57, 122, 132, 158, 184
29	218	31	58, 59	11	57, 59, 95, 122, 124, 132, 146, 158, 186, 198, 266 f
30	42, 218	32	59, 171 f, 247	12	59, 146, 158, 198
31	144, 161, 206, 218	33	57, 59, 95, 187, 247	13	146, 158, 267
33	58	36	59	14—16	123 f
241	152, 183, 194, 210, 262, 266	37	46, 134	14	58, 94, 158, 179, 204
2	224	40	83	15	159, 179, 198, 204
3	188, 255	261	202	16	159, 198
4	256	2	97, 198	17	72, 95, 122, 136, 159
5	266	3	72, 155, 212, 236	18	124, 159, 198
6	46, 69, 72, 199	4	158	19	82, 97, 136, 140, 272
7	188	5	59, 158, 163	20—21	134
9	210, 244, 266	6	57, 69, 155, 212, 236	20	72, 82, 97, 193, 247
10	69, 147, 255	7	124, 204	21	57, 193, 214, 264
11	72, 147, 234, 255	8—10	124	281	95, 252
12	217	8	198, 204	2	252
13	217, 221	9	72, 236, 266	4	120, 248 f
14	168, 221, 232, 266	10	69, 158, 266	5	69
15	217, 221	11	57, 236, 266	6	124, 202
16—18	221	13	20	7	124, 155, 179 f, 236
16	152	14	58, 59, 238	8	124
18	95, 217	15	202	9	128, 131
252	111, 139, 213, 271	16	198	10	86
3—7	120, 121, 145	17	69, 121, 122, 155	11	95
3—6	127	18	94, 123	12	46
3	166, 177	19	69, 136, 178 f	14	57, 69, 72, 125
4	166	20	123	15—22	125
5	202, 272	21	136, 178 f	15—21	131, 145
6	95	22	123	15—16	125
7	189	23	221	15	202
8	42, 185	24	59, 163, 221, 247		
9	187, 198	25	82, 136, 158, 178 f, 204, 226		
10	69, 170, 178, 199, 257	26	59, 202		
11	58	27	59, 159		
12	202	28	59, 144		
14	121, 247	31	161		
16	187, 198	32	122, 158		

17	125, 180	37	82, 224	11	227 f, 266, 272
19	72	38—41	263	12	265
20	58, 125	38	58	13	82, 172, 199
21	82, 159, 202,	40	57, 72	14	58, 177, 193,
	204	41	42, 189, 210		197, 199 f, 246,
22—28	125	42	159, 268		249
22—26	9	46	58, 240	15	177, 197, 200,
22	120	301—10	221		249, 262, 265,
[26]	69	1	202, 266		268
[27]	58	2	187, 198	16	159, 199
23	215	3	178, 189	17	213
25	120	4	59, 178, 189,	18	82, 86, 152, 207
26	214, 267		206, 226	321	95, 189, 238
27—31	125	5	202	2	187, 258
28	72, 158, 202	6	109, 268	3	192
29	42, 120, 168,	7	72, 82, 266, 267	4	192, 221 f
	180	8	42, 58, 109, 160,	5—6	221 f
30	96		266, 267	5	189, 255, 262
31	214, 268	9	221, 266	6	192, 255, 256
32	257	10	82, 109, 160,	7	180, 192, 249,
33	69		202, 210, 224,		255, 260
35	69, 82, 83		248	8	72, 189, 232
36	189	12	106, 168, 262	11	189, 206 f, 213,
37	227	13—14	139		236 f
38	59, 189	13	95, 106	13	42, 83, 154, 184,
39	57, 217, 226,	15	58, 59, 268		219, 255
	267 f	16	59, 82	14	57
291	59, 82, 95, 172,	18	158, 256, 268	15	190, 237
	173	19	97, 255 f	17	258
3	95	20	248, 256, 267 f	18	59, 185, 251,
4	72	21	187, 248, 255 f		258
5	72, 95, 252	23	95, 204	19	162, 190
6	86, 268	25	272	20	42, 211
7	272	27	86, 266	21	189, 212 f
10	72	30	69	23	238
11	82	31	59, 111, 160,	24	232
12	72, 137, 210		231, 272	25	219
13	72	32	196, 231	26	219, 233
14	72, 160, 187, 211	33	246	27	95, 245, 258
16	26, 72	34—38	211	28	174
17	187	34	42, 96, 166	29	42, 65, 213
18	86, 172, 210	35	58, 59, 69, 86,	30	165 f, 166 f, 167
20	59, 210		95, 210 f, 266	31	189, 258, 259
21	46, 210, 272	36	231, 268	33	82, 197
24	69, 224, 268	37	196, 231, 266	34	83, 164, 217,
25	202, 210	311—6	128		218, 228, 232,
26	82, 224, 268	2	86, 109, 209		249, 260
27	268	3	128	35	194
28	72, 248, 266,	4—5	128	331	150, 183, 186,
	268	4	128, 177, 227		191, 194, 217,
29	97	5	180		260
30	42, 58, 210	6	69, 149, 209,	2	42, 157 f, 175,
34	210, 211, 212,		227, 271		217, 235
	264	7—11	120	3	72, 155, 173,
35	35, 43	7	247		191, 223
36	160, 173, 224,	8	121	5	42, 57, 187, 213,
	268	10	121, 248 f		229 f

6	151, 187	32	82, 152, 196, 227	3	86, 268
7	59, 226	33	69	4	57
8	65, 95, 154, 173, 234	34	59, 94, 95, 174	5	82, 232, 255
9	65, 152, 200	35	146, 156	6	129, 139
10	65, 95, 200	351—367	127	7	126, 272
11	230	1—19	127	368—3721	126, 129
12	235	1—3	127	8	13, 72, 96, 130, 153, 253
13	233, 249, 269	1	153	10	130, 131, 189, 236
14	59, 72, 258	2	35, 43, 127, 172, 200, 265, 270	11	57, 131, 200, 202, 236
15	72, 174 f, 228, 258	3	42, 127, 199, 200, 211, 268	12	72, 153, 253
16	65, 222, 233, 251	4	153	13	57, 59, 72, 128, 131, 132, 150, 236, 257
17	95, 162, 197, 233	5—9	127, 129, 145	14	153, 253
18	59, 258	5—8	127	15—21	131, 145
19	69, 72, 86, 217, 256	5	139, 166, 177, 268, 270	16	187, 236
20	147, 243	6	69, 127, 166	18	236
21	42, 167	7	202, 272	19	69
22	69, 243	8	42, 43	21	132, 150, 218
341	194 f, 217	9	69, 270 f	22—29	120
2	42, 152, 217, 264	10	12, 95, 161	22	131
3	161, 269	11—19	127	23—29	146
4	69, 95, 152, 190, 217, 256, 269	11	144, 188, 238	25—29	131
5	57	14	272	25	59, 158
6	72, 217, 218, 241, 256 f	15	12	26	46, 72
7	58, 171, 224	17	12, 13	27	131
9	183, 184, 262	18	42	28	158, 237, 253
10	183, 185, 213	19	272	29	153
11	42, 59, 157, 175, 183, 185, 194, 217 f, 227	20—29	128	30—34	131
12	58, 249 f	20	153	30	59, 202
13	211	21	58, 82, 268, 270	32	58, 264
14	241, 262	22—23	128	33	12, 257
15	250, 265 f	22	128, 268, 270	34	153, 248, 253
17	58	23	12, 13, 42, 58, 96, 128, 271	35	72, 202
18	227, 253	24	59, 82, 202, 268, 271, 272	37	153
19	82	25	270	39	95, 132
20	185, 197	26	270	40	153, 197
23	214	27	128, 199	371—18	140
24	214, 217 f, 237, 259, 267	28	72, 95, 128, 272	1—2	130, 132
25	86, 155 f, 264, 265 f	29	268, 270	2	57, 198, 204
26	86, 262, 269	30—34	127	3	132, 202
27	57	30	72, 86, 156, 209, 213	4	136, 159, 211 f
28	69, 95, 181, 214	31—34a	128	5	82, 96, 132, 203
29	42, 86, 97, 152, 167, 168, 173, 181, 268, 270	31	128, 129	6	57, 132, 159, 190, 203
30	86, 195, 270	32	59, 177	7—14	132
31	199, 211, 258	34	156, 209, 270	7—13	146
		35	12, 46, 160, 163, 172, 270, 271	7—11	123
		361—7	129	7	206, 267
		1	129, 144, 206, 270	8	42, 132, 159, 250
		2	59, 129, 152, 206, 270	9	42, 82, 132, 159, 250
				10	132, 159, 198, 250

11	58, 198, 204	18—26	133, 144	39 ¹⁴ —40 ³²	126
12	159	18—21	133, 134, 135	14—23	141
13	57, 159, 198, 204	18	136, 201, 257	14 ^{ff}	140
15	132	19	57, 59, 97, 136, 156, 249	14	58, 126, 129, 141, 188
16—17	132	20	57, 69, 95, 136, 156, 193 ^f , 203, 250, 257	15	247
16	59, 187, 198			16	266, 272
17	159	21	136	17	69
18	136	22—24	137	18	134, 172 ^f
19—21	132	22	13, 222 ^f	20	13, 258
19—20	133	23	137, 181	21	82, 83, 161, 238
19	46, 82, 152, 153	24	13, 57, 82, 95, 137, 156, 181 ^f	22 ^f	126
20	153, 209, 253	25	272	22	140, 153, 272
21	86, 126, 156, 160, 209, 271	26—27	137, 138, 141	23	69, 140, 153, 186, 234
38 ¹ —39 ¹¹	126	26	83, 96, 138, 143, 156 ^f	40 ²	142
1—19	140	27	58, 138, 143, 153, 187, 253, 256, 267	3	82
1—4	133			5	109, 122 ^f , 142, 143, 160, 161
1	222	39 ¹ —11	133, 139, 140	6	142, 272
2	189, 257	1	139, 140, 204 ^f	7	272
3	42, 257	2—6	139	9	59
4	137, 181 ^f	2	144, 204, 206, 268	13	69, 159
5—8	133, 134	3	140, 204 ^f	14	126, 140, 174
5	42, 134, 237 ^f , 257	4—5	136, 139	15	58, 69, 142, 167, 206
6	12, 42, 156, 200, 250	4	236, 250	16	117, 142
7	12, 95, 200	5	95, 250	17	140, 142, 153, 195, 253
8	12, 200	6	136, 203, 204	18	13, 97, 142
9—12	134	7—10	139, 140	19	59, 72, 140, 153, 238
9	12, 57, 134	7	205, 268	21	140, 153
10	181 ^f , 257	8—9	136	22	142
11	12	8	13, 82, 222	23	140, 153
13—17	134	9	83, 86	24	140, 143
13	12, 134, 185, 193	10	13, 140, 156	25	82, 153, 253, 266, 269
14	134, 135	11	69, 129, 139, 140, 153, 186, 222, 253	26	13, 122 ^f
15	135, 218	12—13	129, 140	28	46
16	58, 82, 135, 218, 257, 271	12	13, 140, 144, 206, 249, 268	29	58, 224, 231
17	135, 185, 192 ^f , 257	13	129, 140, 144, 206	30	82
[37 ¹⁷ —28]	12 ^f				
18—27	135				